

APPENDIX 1 – Summary of Representation NEIGHBOUR COMMENTS

Objections - First Consultation

Visual and Character

- Unacceptable significant impact on public views and surrounding landscape contrary to Core Strategy policies
- Visible from public roads byways and footpaths contrary to information on the application form
- Will detract from the character and appearance of the area
- Would not be inconspicuous by colour and design and would be industrial in nature and therefore totally out of character in this open rural landscape
- Currently unspoilt landscape with extensive open beautiful views
- Guy ropes will increase visual impact
- If lighting is present for aviation warning, the visual impact will be increased.
- The mast is higher than the Cathedral
- Long distance views from Haddenham and Sutton
- Visible from private gardens
- Have evaluations of the Zones of theoretical Visibility been submitted?
- Haddenham already has two very tall masts which mark the natural skyline

Amenity

- Noise to residents from vibrating guy ropes, especially as low background levels
- Overbearing to residents and loss of privacy
- Spoil walks nearby
- Too close to residential properties
- Impacts on residents' psychological well-being
- Over shadowing
- Disruption from construction

Heritage

- Modern mast adversely affects historic landscape
- Contradicts the statement under section 5 of the Haddenham Conservation Area (SPD) which under 5.3 states that the outlook from the

properties on the southwest side of High Street are afforded wonderful views out across the fens which lie at the bottom of the ridge.

- Impact on conservation area designated for historic importance and views across the fen
- Presence of Bronze Age relics
- Haddenham and Aldreth are historic land entrance to the Isle of Ely – this landscape therefore an important part of national heritage

Ecology

- Hazardous to bird population
- In the flight path of swans and geese returning to Welney after visiting Aldreth Fen
- Would cause injuries and death to bats and birds - Should be special measure to prevent injury
- Impact on birds from Guy wires
- Why is less consideration given to this mast than would be for turbines in terms of wildlife impact?
- Impact on bats (maternity roost at 43 High Street Aldreth)
- Full surveys of bat and bird migration routes needed and seasonal flight paths
- Potential impact on *Plecotus Brevimanus* Jenys or *Plectorus auritus* in a nearby roost.
- Impact on other species: Lapwings; Red kites; Voles; Barn owls; Ducks; Newts; Falcons; Tawny owls, Marsh Harriers, Barn owls, Hobby (breeding nearby), Grey partridges (breeding nearby), King fishers
- Impact on badger sets
- Impact on trees
- Close to SSSI and Ouse Washes RAMSAR
- Area designated by the RSPB as requiring full risk assessment prior to wind farm construction (Wind turbines and sensitive bird populations: Spatial Planning for Wind turbines in the Fens Natural Area RSPB 2004)
- No ecological data or walk over search for presence of species

Aviation

- Impact on military Aircraft
- Danger to low flying planes/helicopters and micro lights that regularly fly over the area
- Increased danger if no warning lights
- Danger for hot air balloons and gliders

Flooding/Drainage

- Close to Flood zone 3 – should a flood risk assessment be undertaken.
- Impact on ground water
- Impact on surface water drainage

Highways/Access

- Has not been proper consideration of highways access
- Parking and turning not considered
- Plan does not identify precise location for unloading equipment – concern this will be on/adjacent to public highway on muddy verges possibly muddying the road with impacts on safety of users,
- The infrastructure is not feasible to support construction traffic
- Affects PROW (8 within 1km)
- Disruption to local roads from construction traffic will pose safety risk to horse riders

Technical Issues

- Mast is different height to wind turbines – measuring the wind at the incorrect height is surely counter-productive and will not be accurate
- Scoping report says there is good wind so therefore surely the information that the mast would provide has been obtained.
- Question the need for the structure – especially given timescale for wind farm application given by applicant at public meeting
- No information on decommissioning
- Mast in wrong place to get correct measurements
- Arable land not grazing land
- Other ways to measure the wind

Procedural Issues

- Address of the owner is incorrect
- Byways, PROW not acknowledged in application
- Must consider this with the turbine application as they pose a similar blight to the area
- Lack of information (warning lights)
- Information in application is misleading

- Was not made clear how quickly this application would be coming in – feels rushed through
- Confusing when there is going to be another application for the wind farm (unnecessary)
- Inaccurate information in relation to public visibility calls into question the validity of the whole application (sections 12, 13 and 15)
- Inaccuracies on application form – publicly visible or flood risk and states no trees and hedges
- Lack of consultation by applicant and local authority
- Website was down for some time so deadlines should be extended.
- Flawed assertions in application
- Impact on residents not fully observed in design and access statement
- There should be more time for objectors to put their case
- All properties affected (that can see the mast) should be consulted.
- Full EIA required
- There has not been 'early and meaningful engagement' as required by draft SPD

Other Issues

- Object in principle as associated with the wind farm
- Devalue property
- Heighten anxieties about proposed future development
- Discourage visitors with adverse impact on tourist economy
- Large concrete footprint for something that is temporary
- Precedent for wind farm
- Loss of grade 1 agricultural land
- Agricultural classification – exempt from business rates. If approved will they lose this exemption?
- Other locations more suitable
- Should be a 1 month notice for the enforced removal of the construction
- Impact on horses and riders as horses spooked by the shadow might fall into the ditch
- This is not appropriate farm diversification as little or no employment from construction or when in situ
- Concerned there is insufficient financial covenant for such a project – permitting would be reckless and put burden on public purse.
- Impact on dog walkers
- If such a construction is permitted why not ask for a new submission 130m high with large white discs facing Haddenham so the residents can better appreciate the negative impact of the wind farm
- Already close to solar farm
- Why 2 years - no reference to 2 year monitoring period – sole reason is to assess financial viability

- Object to the length of time it will be present for
- Odour issues
- Personal financial loss – property devalued
- Concerned won't be dismantled
- Solar panels better
- Only reason to grant this would be if there is a reasonable presumption that wind farm likely to proceed
- Question assertions made in application(173)

Comments received in Support

- Think it is important what the expected output will be when wind turbines are built
- Thin grey pole that will be difficult to see
- Will provide vital information on wind speed
- The mast will only be up for two years and will be removed completely after this time Bird deterrents can be fitted to the mast
- Approval for this application in no way means that the wind farm application will be approved.

Additional Objections to further consultation

Discussion on landscape and visual effects

- Errors and inaccuracies.
- Mast will be approx 800m from properties looking towards Berry Fen from Aldreth High Street and Sand Lane in Aldreth and 2km from properties looking towards Berry Fen from Hill Row
- Landscape and visual effects report fails to mention the conservation areas
- Comparisons between mast and water tower are wrong
- Biased
- Report denigrates the landscape value
- Key groups of people who may be affected by changes in view misses many out
- Mast will be visible from Haddenham even on misty day
- Discussion on visual impact did not include consideration of the reflective deflecters. This changes the nature of the structure.
- Endorse description of area in visual impact - it should therefore be protected
- Additional photomontages are misleading – no viewpoints adjacent to properties in Aldreth or Hill Row conservation area. Therefore has not

been an appropriate assessment of visual impact in accordance with industry best practice.

Ecology

- The person doing assessment of impact on swans does not appear to be anyone local so has no credibility with local people.
- Insufficient note has been taken of the importance of Hobbies in the area, or other endangered species
- Bird deflectors are inadequate
- Key assumption on frequency of Whooper and Berwick swans is misleading and inaccurate. Contradicted by local data. SLR should consider the actual records – due to this inaccuracy ECDC will be unable to complete their appropriate assessment
- Pair of breeding Buzzards close to the site
- Concerns relating to the Hobby Site – SLR report states that there is a possibility these could be impacted – therefore request must moved to different part of the site
- Impact on bats outstanding and needs to be addressed
- EIA regs require that all Environmental Information be considered before permission granted

General points

- Still no thought given to bats
- Not enough time for considering amendment
- Still out of character
- Object to glow in the dark detectors
- Does not address environmental concerns
- Deflectors make visual impact worse
- Lack of plan for removal
- Bird scarers demonstrates there will be harm to wildlife
- Glow in the dark impact on night skies
- REG power not contacted people about resubmission
- East cambs should have wind farm guidance notes
- Comments from CAA not addressed
- Object to need as wind measurement survey performed as part of the recent noise measurement survey
- Concern about way the letters of support were obtained
- What is the size of the flat bed trailers and has any assessment of whether they will be able to enter the site been undertaken?