

Minutes of the meeting of the Parish Council held at the Cathodeon Centre on Thursday 23rd April 2009 commencing at 8 pm.

Present: A Gore (Chair), Ms E Cornell (Vice Chair), Mrs E Bald, Dr B Cox, M Gee, B Hammett, R Hickford, Ms T Hunt, T Krarup, G Potter, Dr J Rossiter, Dr V Urwin, Mrs J Williams
Mrs S Parry (Clerk to the Council)

Mrs K France (Press) was in attendance together with five members of the public. District Councillor Batchelor was also in attendance.

Public Forum

Mr Bill Thomas of Little Linton spoke against the wind farm application and asked the Council to especially focus on the issues of the impact on the extraordinary landscape, the A1307 and the impact from noise and potential health issues.

Mr Tony Kelly of Rivey Close spoke for the wind farm application and said that many residents were willing to risk the possible negative impact for environmental benefit.

The Chair opened the meeting of the Parish Council at 8.10pm

- 296 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Daly and Linsdell.
- 297 Declaration of Interests from Members. Cllr Cornell expressed a personal interest under item 301 as spokesperson for Access 1307.
- 298 Approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on 2nd April 2009. Cllr Hickford proposed that the minutes be adopted as a true record of the meeting. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Williams and agreed by the meeting.
- 299 Matters arising from the Minutes of the meeting held on 2nd April 2009. Cllr Bald had issued a report on the Disability Access and Safety Project. This related to the proposal to install six sets of dropped kerbs. She asked councillors to consider her proposals and to highlight any other areas which required attention. **Agenda 7/5**

- 300 Cllr Potter proposed that the payments listed below be paid. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Hammett and agreed by the meeting. Cllrs Urwin and Gore signed the cheques.
- | | | Gross | Excl VAT |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|----------|
| Landmark Restoration Ltd (see report) | 1173 | 1550.00 | |
| Shine Windows | 1174 | 50.00 | |
| R F Goodwin | 1175 | 569.25 | 495.00 |
| R Parry (questionnaire) | 1176 | 42.00 | |
| Wages | 1177, 1178, 1179 & bacs | 3049.76 | |
| E & E Plumridge (questionnaire) | 1180 | 160.71 | 139.75 |

- 301 S/ 0232/09/F Enertrag UK Ltd, land to the south west of Little Linton Farm, Cambridge Road, Linton – Installation of seven wind turbines and associated infrastructure (to include access tracks, crane hardstandings, temporary construction compound, switch house and cables)

The Chair reported on the results of the questionnaire. The number of questionnaires returned was 1169 with 63 neither for nor against, 5 spoilt, 211 for (18%) and 890 against (76%) the application. A detailed analysis of the questionnaire was available to members of the public from the Parish Office. The questionnaire had helped to highlight the major issues and these would be discussed in turn.

Landscape

A report from Cllr Rossiter on landscape and rights of way issues had been circulated. She felt a major concern was that Special Landscape Areas had not been formally identified by the District Council. Neighbouring counties had identified their Special Landscape Areas and she felt it was obvious from the maps why Enertrag had chosen this site.

Cllr Krarup had walked to Catley Park using an old ordnance survey map which had marked places to view.

Cllr Cornell had accepted Mrs Binney's invitation to visit Hildersham Wood from where the views were incredible.

Cllr Hickford had concerns regarding the scale and height of the turbines; he considered that the photomontages were misleading; and there had been no consideration of alternative sites.

Cllr Urwin said that the main negative effect was the number and height of the turbines and the distances between them and footpaths and bridleways.

A report from Cllr Hunt on decommissioning issues had been circulated. Decommissioning was a major concern. She felt that once this greenfield site had turned into a brownfield site it would not revert back, leading to further industrialisation.

Cllr Bald commented that the huge crane in Flaxfields had focused people's attention on the height of the turbines, twice the height of the crane when extended, resulting in a huge visual impact.

Cllr Rossiter said there would be no escape from the visual impact. She was also very concerned that Enertrag had made no effort to meet any of the objections raised in the scoping enquiry. The British Horse Society recommended that turbines are not sited any closer than three times their height to a bridleway, although this was not a statutory requirement. The surface of bridleway number 7 would have to be strengthened due to it being turned into a haul road for the heavy equipment. No thought had been given as to when and if the bridleway would be closed, possibly through the whole construction period and no alternative route had been considered. These issues must be addressed by conditioning if the application is permitted.

Cllr Williams, a horse rider, echoed these concerns.

Environment of the Village

Cllr Cornell reported on the historic environment. The assessment by Enertrag did not meet the requirements for a planning application. South Cambridgeshire District Council's Local Plan Policy EN30 stated: "The District Council will require that applications for planning permission for development in conservation areas or affecting their setting, be accompanied by sufficient details to allow the impact of proposals to be assessed. This must include drawings or other pictorial material which illustrates the proposed buildings in their context." She was to meet the District Council's conservation officer to discuss this issue as Enertrag had said that the impact on all 74 listed buildings in and off the High Street would be negligible.

Cllr Cornell asked for any documentary evidence showing the blimp and listed buildings including Little Linton and Linton Village College to be forwarded to her. The government considered the impact of the historical setting and listed buildings to be a very important consideration.

Cllr Cox said that the turbines would dominate the skyline and an outstanding conservation area.

Cllr Hickford had contacted Enertrag regarding their photomontages who had admitted that they were 'perceived to be misleading.' He reported that there was evidence of the earliest settlement in Cambridgeshire on the site and archaeological trenches should be dug.

A1307

Cllr Gee said that the visual impact of the turbines would increase the danger on the road.

A report from Cllr Cornell had been circulated. She said that that the responses to the youth questionnaire had highlighted safety on the A1307 as their main concern. The Camgrain junction had been a scene of fatal accidents. The road would need to be closed at times for construction traffic.

Road safety had been cited when the application for a wind farm alongside the A14 was turned down. Drivers at the Hildersham junction would experience a fixated view of the turbines where there is a history of accidents for this junction.

Cllr Urwin said that the Council should not concentrate on the A1307 as it was difficult to quantify the possible impact of the turbines on road safety.

Cllr Hickford disagreed and said that the A1307 was a major concern; the application on the A14 was refused because of potential danger.

Cllr Bald reported that on the continent, where there is more history, eight road fatalities had been contributed to wind turbines.

Impact on Health and Wellbeing and other issues

Cllr Cox said that the turbines would be sited too close to the schools, especially the Granta School, and populated areas. The low frequency noise, dependent on the sub soil, would impact on health. Scotland did not allow turbines within 4kms of housing so why should England? Evidence was accumulating that turbines have a negative impact on health.

Cllr Urwin was concerned for Linton Zoo and its international reputation. We should not gamble on the possible negative effect the turbines might have on the Zoo.

Cllr Bald was concerned about noise; there was already noise from A1307 and Camgrain which affected residents' well being. The noise from the turbines would not be a gentle swish but the sound of an engine.

Cllr Hickford was also concerned about noise, the effect on Hildersham Wood, a site of Special Scientific Interest (SSI) and the serious consequences for light aircraft flying to Duxford.

Cllr Rossiter was also concerned about noise and reported that Enertrag's Design and Access Statement, Section 6, stated 'Working hours are usually between 7am and 7pm, or dusk, on Monday to Saturday. Residents would be informed of any unavoidable additional disturbance such as noise or extended working hours.' How would residents be informed before it happened? Regarding adverse impact on TV signals, Enertrag had stated that assessments had been made using standard software, and no reassurance had been given that there would not be a problem. Enertrag stated that adverse TV reception would be investigated and remedied following advice by an aerial or TV expert.

Cllr Hammett said that the crane in Flaxfields was affecting his TV reception.

Cllr Cornell confirmed that the BBC had stated that there would be a problem; all TV aerials point towards Catley Park. Linton was known to have reception problems and residents could not readily use satellite dishes in the Conservation Area or on listed buildings.

Cllr Cornell said that the government was promoting clean offshore energy but it was difficult to see how Cambridgeshire would meet its offshore targets! Enertrag was promoting a site which other companies and legislative bodies would not consider. She had brought Hildersham Wood to the attention of the SCDC ecology officer as a wet meadow.

Cllr Bald had concerns regarding the lack of storage facilities, the impact on aircraft, flight paths and radar to and from Stansted, Luton and Duxford.

Cllr Hickford commented that this would open the door to future development. Enertrag find speculative sites and only expect 2 out of 10 to be passed.

There being no further observations, a vote was taken. There was 1 vote in favour of recommending approval of the application and 11 against. The Chair did not vote, in accordance with the Council's usual practice.

It was agreed that Cllrs Gore and Cornell would produce a draft response setting out reasons for refusal, based on policy and the observations of councillors expressed during the meeting, and conditions to be attached in the event the District Council was in favour of the application. It would be emailed to all councillors with a view to finalising the draft by 29 March, for submission to the District Council.

The Chair thanked the Clerk, her assistant and other helpers for their work on the questionnaire and the application generally.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm

Signed

Date

Note: Copies of reports and documents referred to above can be inspected at the Council's office.