

Bradford City Council v Woodhead & Sons Ltd

Inquiry: September 7, 8, 1994

Decision letter: December 6, 1994

Inspector: R. P. Brooks, BA(Hons), MRTPI

Ref.: T/APP/W4705/A/94/236035/P7

Appln. No.: 93/6/03601

Acts: [TCPA 1990, s.78, Sched. 6](#)

Circular: 10/73

PPGs: 2, 22, 24

British Standards: 4142, 8233 Renewable energy source proposal—output sufficient to be thought a worthwhile contribution to target for reduction of greenhouse gases emissions—detrimental effect of landscape impact increased and noise intrusion greater—previous planning refusal for similar development for fewer turbines—appeal dismissed.1.0Facts1.1

The appeal was against the failure of the Council to determine within the prescribed period an application for the erection of eight wind turbines on land north of the junction of Otley Road and Heights Lane, East Morton, West Yorkshire.2.0Development proposal2.1

“3.

Although your clients had sought full planning permission, they requested at the inquiry that the number of turbines shown on the site layout plan, and their siting, should be regarded as indicative. If planning permission were granted, further consideration could then be given to these matters in order to deal with any perceived problems of landscape impact and noise; a condition could be applied to control the latter by reference to an acceptable absolute maximum. The Council did not oppose this request, though they believed it would lead to problems in framing reasonable and valid conditions because analysis of noise was a detailed matter which depended heavily on the precise siting of the sources.4.

PPG 22 , *Renewable Energy* advises planning authorities to consider granting permission in terms which will permit the siting of individual machines within carefully defined areas rather than within precisely defined positions. The appeal site is clearly large enough to permit a measure of flexibility along these lines. However, I must have regard to the nature of the current proposal and to its history. A scheme for six turbines was submitted in October 1992, subsequently reduced to four, and was refused planning permission in August 1993. The number of machines was then increased to eight in the current proposal, in the light of discussions with the turbine manufacturer and to increase the power generation from the site; this was to address one of the reasons for refusal of the first application, namely that the benefits of electricity generation from renewable energy had not been shown to outweigh harm to the landscape. *244 5.

The submitted layout plan clearly formed part of the application for full permission, which was evidently considered as such not only by the Council but also by consultees and third parties. At the inquiry detailed information was submitted on levels

and possible heights of the turbines. It is evident that both the number of turbines, and their siting, are matters considered in detail by your clients, the Council and others, and that accordingly it would not be appropriate for me to regard the submitted site layout as solely illustrative. I shall therefore regard it as part of the application, though I shall have regard to the scope for flexibility on the number of turbines and their siting, and to the implications this could have for both landscape and noise impact.”^{3.0}Appeal site and its surroundings^{3.1}

“6.

The appeal site comprises some 22 ha. (55 acres) of permanent pasture on the east side of the Sunny Dale valley, north of the village of East Morton. It is divided into a number of fields by drystone walls and one such wall, running roughly north/south, separates it from the extensive, open Bingley Moor to the east. From a high point of some 270 m. on this wall, the land falls to the north-west and west, the lowest point being about 210 m. in the south-west corner. Prominent crags run north-west/south-east, forming a pronounced break of slope above Otley Road, which climbs the valley side from East Morton and forms the southern boundary of the site. Two 33 Kw. overhead electricity lines on 10 m. high poles cross the site, one running roughly north/south and the other running above the crags, from south to north-west. There is a group of modern agricultural buildings in the south-east corner of your clients' land, close to the junction of Otley Road and Heights Lane.^{7.}

A ribbon of settlement extends northwards along the beck from the core of East Morton village towards Sunny Dale Reservoir, including both long-established housing associated with former industry, and a number of modern dwellings. The valley floor is generally well-wooded. North of the appeal site, and on the opposite side of the valley, is further enclosed farmland, with the expanse of Morton Moor sweeping around the head of the valley to the north.^{8.}

The proposed turbines would be spaced a minimum of 140 m. apart, broadly in two parallel rows along the north/south axis of the site. Because of varying land levels the four machines in the northern most field would be at lower levels (232–258 m.) than the rest (260–268 m.). They would have twin-bladed rotors, 36.4 m. in diameter, on tubular towers 25–30 m. high. Although the original application referred to a uniform tower height of 30 m. you proposed at the inquiry that those on higher ground be reduced to 25 m. so as to achieve some consistency in hub height across the site.^{9.}

There are public footpaths, evidently well-used, both above and below the site. The former runs north-east across Bingley Moor from Otley Road, and the latter links the same highway to the Sunny Dale valley. Further rights of way traverse the valley sides to north and west. The nearest dwellings are Westleigh and Sunnybank, south of Otley Road and some 200 m. from the nearest proposed turbine; Keepers Lodge (220 m.) immediately east of the site; Providence Row (240 m.), a substantial Victorian terrace in the valley bottom to the west; and Alma Terrace (260 m.), a terrace of similar character on Otley Road next to the south-west corner of the site.” *²⁴⁵ 4.0Local planning context^{4.1}

“10.

The Development Plan comprises the West Riding of Yorkshire Development Plan; its Keighley and Bingley Town Map, approved in 1963; and the West Yorkshire Structure Plan of 1980. In the first two documents the appeal site is included in both the green belt and an Area of Great Landscape Value. In the Structure Plan it lies within one of a number of broadly-defined Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) where development will normally be accepted only if it would not adversely affect the visual character of those Areas.^{11.}

In the draft Upper Airedale Local Plan, published in 1983/84, the appeal site lies within both the green belt and a SLA, the latter being a detailed definition of that indicated diagrammatically in the Structure Plan. Such Areas are described as “the most attractive countryside in the County ...”, and Upper Airedale is said to contain “some of the most unspoilt moorland and valley landscapes in the County.” Policy UA/EN9 states that development will normally only be accepted if it will not

adversely affect the visual character of a SLA. The draft plan was the subject of a public inquiry in 1988, and subsequent Inspector's report, but further progress towards statutory adoption was arrested by commencement of work on the Bradford Unitary Development Plan (UDP).¹²

The UDP has completed its deposit stage and a public inquiry into objections is to commence in Spring 1995. Policy NR8 states that wind turbine proposals will normally be permitted subject to a number of criteria, namely that they will not adversely affect the character of the landscape, particularly in SLAs, or undeveloped upland or moorland; that special attention is paid to their relationship to other such developments locally; that there are no unacceptable noise problems to local residents; that the visual impact of the turbines is minimised; and that they are removed if they cease operation. The UDP carries forward the green belt notation of earlier plans and also includes the appeal site in a SLA where, under policy EN14, development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the visual character. Definition of such Areas draws on landscape appraisal work originally carried out for the West Yorkshire County Structure Plan; so far as the appeal site is concerned, the SLA corresponds to the protected areas in previous plans.¹³

To amplify UDP policy NR8 the Council has published draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Wind Turbine Developments. This advises, inter alia, that turbines may be more appropriately sited in enclosed upland, such as the moorland fringe and areas of enclosed pasture, than on unspoilt open moorlands; in the former, more varied, landscapes they can appear less alien than in the latter, where they may harm the wilderness character of the moors. Detailed criteria to be applied to siting include visibility from key viewpoints; relationship to landform; size, number and finish of turbines; and cumulative impact. Criteria on noise impact set limits to increases in background noise levels at existing dwellings, together with ceiling levels for noise during both day and night.¹⁴

Turning to the weight to be attached to these various policies, you argued that the appeal site could not reasonably be regarded as Special Landscape; it had no singular characteristics but was typical of large parts of the District and the South Pennines generally. The utilitarian farm buildings, and the overhead lines, detracted from its appearance. SLA protection was a local designation of the type which the Secretary of State considered unnecessary ***246** and unhelpful. It was a broad-brush approach which had not previously been properly tested; however, it would be so tested at the forthcoming UDP inquiry as you, and two other parties, had submitted objections to the concept.¹⁵

Whilst I accept that the appeal site has limited intrinsic landscape merit, when seen as part of the wider surrounding landscape it marks an important transition between the openness and wildness of the moors to the north and east and the enclosure and shelter of the valley bottom to the west. Together with the moors above, it is seen as part of the open, rural setting of the villages and towns of the Aire Valley, whilst also being characteristic of the attractive, settled agricultural landscape of the valley sides. Neither the farm buildings nor the electricity lines have a significant adverse impact relative to the size of the site as a whole. It is also clear that, along with policies on the green belt, those on landscape protection are of long standing and have been consistently applied to your clients' land through successive plans. I see no reason to question inclusion of the land within a SLA for the purposes of this appeal and I give weight to the relevant policy accordingly.¹⁶

Less weight can be accorded to the current UDP policy on wind turbines (NR8), and to the supporting SPG, in view of their draft status. A number of objections have been lodged to the former, and aspects of the latter, notably the noise criteria, are likely to be amended in the light of recently completed public consultations. However, with the proviso that both require further testing in detail, I consider that they are broadly successful in applying national advice in PPG 22 at local level and that they are relevant to this appeal."^{5.0}Planning issues^{5.1}

The Inspector was of the opinion that there were three principal planning issues as follows: "(i)

the impact which the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape, having regard to local planning policies;(ii)

the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents in terms of possible noise and disturbance;(iii)

whether, if serious harm would be caused in either of these respects, it would be outweighed by the contribution which the proposal could make to satisfying the demand for electricity in the light of national policy on developing renewable energy sources.”6.0Landscape impact6.1

“18.

Whilst there was considerable common ground between the two main parties at the inquiry on the main view points from which the appeal proposal would be seen, it was not surprising that opinions differed significantly on the scale and nature of the impact it would have. Landscape appraisal inevitably involves a substantial subjective element, though I have sought to make it as broad-based as possible: firstly, by viewing the appeal site from a wide range of vantage points under different light and weather conditions; and, secondly, by informing my own observations with the detailed appraisals submitted to the inquiry, notably the photomontages and assessments of zones of visual impact.19.

I do not disagree with the view expressed for the Council that wind *247 turbines are an acceptable use in principle in the green belt. They are slender structures which need to be fairly widely spaced, in open and exposed locations, for operational reasons. They are thus unlikely to prejudice the main purposes of the green belt as set out in PPG 2 . However, that Note also states that the visual amenities of the green belt should not be injured by development proposals which, though they would not prejudice its main purpose, might be inappropriate by reason of their siting, materials or design; this is reiterated in PPG 22 .20.

Whilst wind turbines of the type proposed often appear as striking or even startling features in the landscape, they are in themselves strong, simple and well-designed engineering forms which follow in the tradition of many early industrial structures which were first regarded as revolutionary, but which are now accepted and widely cherished as features in the landscape. In landscapes which are largely man-made, such evolution appears to me to be both inevitable and desirable. However, they have a number of distinctive features, notably their large size, prominence, strong vertical emphasis and characteristics of movement, which require careful assessment against local landscape character.21.

You argued that land which was sufficiently exposed to be suitable for wind power generation must inevitably also be visually prominent, and that if the Council's policies were applied strictly it would be difficult to find any suitable sites. The appeal site was precisely the sort of enclosed landscape to which SPG directed wind turbines and the appeal proposal would not detract from the visual qualities of the moors. There was no difference in policy terms between this site and those at Chelker Reservoir and Ovenden Moor, where turbines had been permitted.22.

However, PPG 22 states that the desirability of exploiting renewable energy resources must always be weighed against the visual impact of turbines on the landscape, and that such assessment should be made on a site-specific basis. Also, the Council's SPG can only carry limited weight, for reasons I have already referred to, and provides only a general guide, to be interpreted in the light of local circumstances. It is to those circumstances that I now turn.23.

From publicly accessible viewpoints close at hand to the south and west, the proposal would only have limited impact on the landscape. Although several turbines would be seen in whole or in part from Otley Road, and from the public footpath which links it to Providence Row, the full extent of the development would be concealed by sharply rising land in the foreground. Any turbines visible would also be seen in the context of the existing overhead lines and farm buildings, both of which are prominent at close quarters. Travelling south along Carr Lane or Heights Lane, views of the turbines on the southern half of the site would quickly be masked by landform and trees. From East Morton northwards to Providence Row and Botany

Drive, views would be partial and oblique, again due to landform and the screening provided by the extensive tree cover on the valley floor, at least during the summer months.²⁴

From the west side of the Sunny Dale valley, notably from Street Lane and from the footpath which runs north to the reservoir, all the turbines would be very conspicuous. In the former view the full extent of the site would be seen, with the turbines largely silhouetted against the sky. In the latter they would be prominent on the hillside, though their impact would be somewhat lessened by being seen partially against a backcloth of enclosed *248 fields. Sunny Dale is a pleasant, small-scale, pastoral valley which is evidently well-used for informal recreation, and in my opinion its character would be unacceptably harmed by the appeal proposal. The turbines would appear intrusive and out-of-scale with all other landscape features, and their impact in this tranquil setting would be exacerbated by the insistent motion of the rotors.²⁵

You accepted that the proposal would be conspicuous from the footpath over the moor from Keepers Lodge to Ilkley, but argued that this would be an outward view over the largely urbanised Aire Valley and would not detract from the wildness of the moorland. Travelling north along the path the backdrop to the turbines would initially be enclosed fields on the opposite side of Sunny Dale and then the urban area of Keighley to the south-west, climbing the side of the Aire Valley. However, the latter is some 4 km. away whereas most of the turbines would be within 400 m. or so of the path. Although some other vertical structures can be seen from the Moor, notably the Ovenden Moor turbines, pylons across the Aire Valley, and two tall radio masts on Morton Moor to the north-west, none is unduly conspicuous because of the distance they are away; also, the last-named, though tall, appear essentially as a single isolated structure. By contrast, the turbines would be intrusive and even intimidating in the broad westward vista from the path, an effect which would be further aggravated by the turning of the rotors. They would detract from the qualities of wildness and spaciousness which are important both to the landscape setting of the towns and villages of the Aire Valley, and to public enjoyment of the Moors. Although you argued that this path was less well-used than that across the Moor a kilometre or so to the east, it seems to me that walkers can enjoy a degree of solitude here, albeit at no great distance from settlements, which would be markedly diminished by the appeal proposal.²⁶

The Council presented no detailed evidence in support of their argument that there would be an adverse impact on the conservation areas of East Morton and Micklethwaite. The nearest turbine would be almost 600 m. from the boundary of the East Morton Conservation Area and even more from that in Micklethwaite. I am not convinced that there would be any discernible effects on the Conservation Areas as a whole at this distance, especially as the field of view would be limited by landform, trees and buildings in the foreground; the character and appearance of those areas would thus be preserved. However, from viewpoints in East Morton from which the turbines would be seen, some of which were shown in your clients' landscape evidence, they would be very conspicuous on the skyline above the village. That skyline, and the land sloping up to it, provide an attractive and generally unspoilt setting for the tight-knit village, in which the proposed turbines would be discordant and out-of-scale elements.²⁷

Views of the site from 2–5 km. away would be strongly influenced by distance and landform. With increasing distance the field of view widens along the Aire Valley and the impact of the turbines would correspondingly diminish quite sharply. From many viewpoints they would be seen against a backcloth of rising ground, rather than silhouetted against the sky. Looking west from the footpath over the Moor from Dick Hudson's Public House, they would be largely screened by intervening high ground and seen only in part; from the higher parts of the Moor they would be seen below the skyline. From the Aire Valley Road, and the hillsides to the south, their impact would be much reduced by distance and the urban character of much of the *249 valley floor. Over 5 km. I do not consider that the proposals would have any significant landscape impact, because they would either be dwarfed by distance or concealed by intervening high ground.²⁸

In addition to considering impact on the landscape as a whole, I have also assessed a further matter on which your clients' landscape witness submitted detailed evidence, namely the effects which the proposed turbines would have on the outlook from nearby dwellings. Residents cannot expect to have the views they enjoy protected for all time, but wind turbines are so large and striking that I believe their appearance from dwellings close by can reasonably be regarded as a matter of public

interest in the terms set out in paragraph 23 of the Annex to PPG 22 . None of the turbines would be clearly seen from within Keepers Lodge, but some would be visible, in whole or in part, from the dwellings south of Otley Road, and from Alma Terrace and Providence Row, at distances of upwards of 200 m. Although the landform would conceal the full extent of the development from most of these viewpoints, I consider that those machines which would be visible would appear intrusive and even intimidating, largely because of their height above the dwellings. I have no doubt that the suggested planting to the rear of Alma Terrace and Providence Row would in due course help to screen the turbines from view from those houses, but the land in question is outside your clients' control and there was no evidence of a reasonable prospect of the planning being carried out during the lifetime of a planning permission.²⁹.

Whilst not a determining issue, the adverse effects on the outlook of local residents adds some additional weight to my findings on landscape impact. These are that there would not be unacceptable harm to the landscape viewed from a distance of upwards of around 2 km. but that such harm would be caused at closer range, especially in views of the appeal site from west and east. I have assessed whether varying the number of siting of the turbines could offset this harm, but I have concluded that it would not, because of the prominence of the site as a whole from a number of key viewpoints. I have also considered whether conditions could be applied which would reduce visual impact to an acceptable level, but attention to colour and finish, however careful, could not ameliorate the effects of scale and prominence which I regard as particularly harmful in this case.³⁰.

To the harm which would be caused to the landscape directly must be added that to the aims of local planning policies. Although you have disputed the relevance of the Council's policies for protecting landscape character, such policies have been carried forward through successive plans and appear to me to be generally well-founded and in line with national advice on safeguarding the countryside for its own sake. To approve the appeal proposal would be likely to call into question the consistency and validity of this approach, and could encourage submission of further proposals for harmful change which would be progressively more difficult for the Council to resist. I conclude on the first determining issue that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape, having regard to local planning policies.^{7.0Noise7.1}

“31.

PPG 24 , *Planning and Noise* has been published since the inquiry, but does not appear to me to contain any issues relevant to this appeal over *250 and above those considered at the inquiry with reference to PPG 22 , British Standards (BS) 4142 and 8233, World Health Organisation (WHO) and European Commission (EC) documents on noise, and the then extant Circular 10/73 , *Planning and Noise*. I have therefore relied upon these latter documents, together with the noise assessments provided by both main parties.³².

PPG 22 does not contain a methodology for assessing turbine noise, but recommends that planning applications should be accompanied by a range of acoustic information, including measured background noise levels and predicted levels at nearby properties. Your clients submitted data on measurements made near Keepers Lodge over a period of a week, on comparative measurements there and at both Alma Terrace and the west elevation of Providence Row over three hours, and on further readings at Alma Terrace and the east side of Providence Row over several days. Most of these measurements, correlated against data from Wilsden on wind speed 10 m. above ground level, show fairly wide ranges of noise levels, rising with increasing wind speed. Many of the predictions by both main parties are therefore inevitably sensitive to assumptions made on prevailing background levels within such ranges.³³.

The model of turbine proposed has dual-speed operation, the lower speed of 27 rpm commencing at the cut-in wind speed of 4.5 m. per second and increasing to 40 rpm at a wind speed of 8 m. per second. The Council took the changeover wind speed at hub height to be equivalent to a wind speed of 6.2 m. per second at 10 m. above ground level, and derived the following background levels at the latter wind speed from your clients' data; this approach was not challenged.

All figures dB(A) L eq for eight turbines.36.

On the basis of these figures there would be increases of around 1 dB(A) at Westleigh, 3 dB(A) at Keepers Lodge, and 12 dB(A) at Providence Row. All the new levels would comply with the Council's SPG nighttime limit of 42 dB(A) L eq , though the maximum increase of 7.5 dB(A) would be exceeded at Providence Row.37.

The Council made further predictions for a wind speed of 8 m. per second, corresponding to the changeover to higher turbine speed.

All figures dB(A) L eq for eight turbines.38.

These figures represent increases of 7 dB(A) at Westleigh, 2 dB(A) at Alma Terrace, 18 dB(A) at Providence Row and 8 dB(A) at Keepers Lodge. The Council's SPG nighttime limit would be exceeded in all cases, as would the maximum increase at Providence Row and Keepers Lodge. The increase at Keepers Lodge needs to be seen in the context of the likelihood of substantial wind-induced background noise from the trees around the house at times when the turbines would be operational, and the screening provided by the large outbuilding to the side. For these reasons I do not regard the impact on this property as inherently unacceptable.39.

The situation at Westleigh and Providence Row is cause for greater concern. Increases at the former of 7 dB(A) at the higher turbine speed, and 12–18 dB(A) at the latter over both speeds, would clearly be perceptible, even allowing for rising background noise with increasing wind speed. Although BS4142 must be applied with caution, the guidance which it gives on the significance of increases over background seems to me to be of general relevance. In this case the increases at both properties would be above the level of 5 dB deemed of marginal significance, and that at Providence Row would be well above the level considered likely to attract complaints.40.

A number of factors give credence to these levels of increase. Firstly, no penalty has been applied for tonal noise, the evidence on that subject being inconclusive; accordingly, the predictions may well err on the side of caution. Secondly, it was accepted for your clients that although background noise levels to the west side of Providence Row were sustained by noise from the beck, those to the rear were influenced by shelter; the terrace could therefore be subject to the effect, referred to in paragraph 42 of the Annex to PPG 22 , of experiencing low background noise even at times when wind speed at the turbine site would be well above cut-in level. Thirdly, even if the background level were constrained to 30 dB(A), to bring it more in line with BS4142, the increases would still be substantial, in the order of 10–16 dB(A). I regard the likely scale of noise increase at Providence Row as unacceptable, *252 bearing in mind the seclusion of the property and the consequent low background noise levels which its occupants currently enjoy.41.

Turning to the specific question of the likelihood of sleep disturbance, it was agreed that internal noise levels in dwellings could be derived by adding 3 dB(A) to the free-field level to take account of reflection from the facade, and subtracting 10 dB(A) for the insulating effect of an open window, as set out in BS8233. This would give internal levels of 33–35 dB(A) at the four properties noted, at wind speeds of 5 m. per second, and 39–40 dB(A) at 8 m. per second, the highest values in each case being at Keepers Lodge.⁴²

Evidence on an appropriate maximum for continuous noise at night was somewhat contradictory, that in the WHO document being given as both 30 dB(A) L_{eq} and 30–35 dB(A) L_{eq}; the E.C. document referred to the latter range. I was informed that the current WHO standard is 35 dB(A) L_{eq}. Whilst I accept your clients' view that the WHO standard should not be rigidly applied, I consider it appropriate to follow the approach adopted in the case of the appeals at Fullbrook Barton and Crackaway Barton, Devon, that for sleep disturbance purposes predicted internal noise levels should be as low as possible within the range 30–35 dB(A).⁴³

Even discounting Keepers Lodge as likely to be subject to high localised background noise, it appears to me that there is a significant risk of sleep disturbance at the other three properties at the lower turbine speed, and that this risk would markedly increase at the higher speed. It would also be influenced by the fact that noise from Otley Road, which would largely control daytime background levels, would be much reduced at night, whereas that from the turbines would be continuous as long as wind speeds exceeded cut-in level.⁴⁴

I have considered whether the noise impact could be reduced to acceptable levels by varying the number of turbines, a matter on which detailed evidence was given by both sides. That for your clients showed that, at a wind speed of 5 m. per second, a range of combinations of four to six turbines would all meet the Council's proposed nighttime limit of 42 dB(A) L_{eq} and that, with the exception of the effects of certain combinations on Providence Row, criteria for increase over background would also be satisfied. However, similar calculations by the Council for a wind speed of 8 m. per second predicted increases at Providence Row of some 9–16 dB(A) in all cases but one, even on the basis of rounding up the background level to 30 dB(A). I consider that there remains a strong probability of unacceptable disturbance there, even with a reduced number of turbines, and that it would be inappropriate for me to grant planning permission on such a basis. Nor, in the light of all the evidence, do I consider that reasonable and enforceable conditions could be framed to control noise to acceptable levels. I conclude on the second determining issue that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable effects on the living conditions of nearby residents in terms of noise and disturbance.”^{8.0}Inspector's conclusions^{8.1}

“⁴⁵.

I now turn to whether the contribution which the proposal would make to satisfying the demand for electricity, in the light of national policy on developing renewable energy sources, would outweigh the harm it would cause in respect of the two preceding issues. PPG 22 states that it is ***253** Government policy to stimulate the exploitation and development of renewable energy sources wherever they have prospects of being economically and environmentally acceptable. To do so will contribute to limiting emissions of greenhouse gases from burning fossil fuels; the Government is committed to take measures aimed at returning such emissions to their 1990 levels by A.D. 2000. Its aim is to work towards a figure of 1,000 Mw. of new electricity generating capacity from renewable energy sources by the latter date. Wind energy has emerged as one of the more promising sources of renewable energy in Britain and there is no doubt about the technical feasibility of harnessing it.⁴⁶

At the estimated average wind speed for the appeal site of just over 6 m. per second, you calculate the output of each turbine at some 774,000 Kw. hours of electricity per year; the whole scheme could produce sufficient power to meet the needs of around 1,650 homes. However, this wind speed figure is based on data from elsewhere and I agree with you that it is reasonable to assume that the actual figure could be higher; at 8 m. per second the power yield from the site would be nearly doubled and would be equivalent to the needs of about 2,960 homes. These figures were not challenged by the Council, who accepted in principle the benefits of generation from renewable sources.⁴⁷

Supporters drew attention to public concern about atmospheric pollution locally, which caused respiratory problems and acid rain. Wind power was seen as a way of countering such problems, both now and for the benefit of future generations. Friends of the Earth sought a more positive attitude to development of wind power, which could help achieve the target of a 30 per cent, reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by A.D. 2005, set out in their Climate Resolution. It was argued that there was widespread local support for development of wind power, as evidenced in responses to newspaper polls, but that supporters would not necessarily pursue their case as vocally as opponents.⁴⁸

I have carefully considered all these matters and it is self-evident that the electricity generated by your clients' proposal would be significant, could be considered to displace an equivalent number of units generated by fossil fuels, and would contribute to the total supply from renewable sources; to that extent it would further Government policy. It is also clear that wind power can only be exploited where the wind is of sufficient speed, duration and reliability; sites which meet such requirements should not be lightly discounted. However, PPG 22 states that the Government's policies for developing renewable energy sources must be weighed carefully with its continuing commitment to policies for protecting the environment. In this case I consider that the contribution which the proposal could make to satisfying the demand for electricity in the light of national policy on developing renewable energy sources does not outweigh the harm it would cause to the landscape and to the living conditions of nearby residents.”^{9.0}Decision: appeal dismissed^{9.1}

“⁴⁹.

I have considered all the other matters raised at the inquiry and in the written representations, including the possible effects which the proposal might have on the ecology of the Moor to the east, proposed for designation as a Site of Special Scientific Interest; on appreciation of the ancient monuments there; and on highway safety on nearby roads.” *²⁵⁴ 10.0Comment^{10.1}

The production capacity of the originally proposed eight turbines enabled the development to be considered in the context of a material contribution to the supply of energy from renewable sources in accordance with Government policy. However, the adverse effects on both noise and landscape impact led the Inspector to conclude that the disadvantages outweighed the advantage of greater capacity.^{10.2}

See also *Bradford Metropolitan Council and Gillson and Sons* (below, p. 255) and *Bradford Metropolitan Council and Feather* (below, p. 267). *²⁵⁵
END OF DOCUMENT