

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning Committee
AUTHOR/S: Corporate Manager – Planning &
Sustainable Communities

6th June 2007

APPEALS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION: SUMMARIES OF DECISIONS OF INTEREST – FOR INFORMATION

Purpose

1. To highlight recent Appeal decisions of interest forming part of the more extensive Appeals report, now only available on the Council's website and in the Weekly Bulletin.

Summaries

Mrs C Ward – Wind Turbine – Rookery farm, Broadway, Bourn – Appeal allowed.

2. This application was originally submitted in July 2002. It was eventually refused in July 2006 on the grounds that the turbine would be a distraction for pilots during take-offs and landings at Bourn airfield and would thus be a danger to flight safety. The decision to refuse was based on advice from the Rural Flying Corps based at Bourn aerodrome.
3. The appellant provided her own detailed technical evidence to support the claim that flight safety would be unaffected. The inspector noted that most pilots approach Bourn airfield from the south and land on runway 36. The rotating blades would be clearly seen by pilots coming in to land from the south of the runway but visibility would be extremely restricted on take-off or go-around from runway 18. He did not expect the turbine to be an unacceptable distraction and felt it would soon become a familiar feature. It would be visible from some distance and would not suddenly startle pilots.
4. For pilots visiting the airfield for the first time, the turbine would be recognised as a feature which is now becoming common in the countryside, sometimes close to airfields. It was noted that neither the Defence Estates nor the Civil Aviation Authority now had any objections. The principle of renewable energy is supported by government policy.
5. The inspector was satisfied that the appellant's research indicated an absence of events where pilots have been distracted by wind turbines. While there may always be a first time, he was satisfied that this turbine would not be an unacceptable distraction and should be supported.
6. Permission was granted subject to the standard time limit.