



Allerdale Local Plan (Part 1)

Main Modifications

Representation Form

Please complete a separate representation form for each Main Modification you wish to comment on. Representations must be made in writing, using the comments form, and sent either by email or post to:

By post: Kerry Trueman, Programme Officer, Allerdale Borough Council, Allerdale House, Workington CA14 3YJ

By email: kerry.trueman@allerdale.gov.uk

Telephone: 07582 310 364

Please return to the Programme Officer no later than 4 pm on Friday 28th March 2014

Allerdale Borough Council is now seeking representations on the Main Modifications only. The changes are proposed by the Council to address issues of legal compliance and soundness and only representations on these matters will be accepted. All representations will be forwarded to the Inspector who will consider them prior to issuing her report. By submitting this form you are consenting to your personal information and representations being stored and used for this purpose.

Further advice and guidance can be obtained by contacting the Programme Officer directly or by visiting the Allerdale Borough Council Website:

www.allerdale.gov.uk/localplanexamination

“Allerdale – a great place to live, work and visit”

(For official use only)

Consultee ID _____ MM _____ Policy _____ Elem. Sound _____ Date Rec. _____

Part A: Personal details

*if an agent is appointed, the contact details of both parties must be completed.

	Personal details	Agent's details (if applicable)*
Title	Mr	
First name	Neil	
Last name	Foxall	
Job title (if applicable)	Planning and Development Manager	
Organisation (if applicable)	West Coast Energy Ltd	
Address	Mynydd Awel, Mold Business Park, Maes Gwern, Mold, Flintshire,	
Postcode	CH7 1XN	
Tel Number	01352 705247	
Fax Number		
Email	neil.foxall@westcoastenergy.co.uk	

Please indicate if you wish to be notified of any of the following:

Publication of the inspectors' recommendations	X
Adoption of the Local Plan	X
Other planning policy and Local Plan news	X

If you have provided an email address our default is to update you electronically, however, if you would prefer paper correspondence please tick here:

Part B: Your Representation

1. To which proposed change (Main Modification Number) does this representation relate?

Main Modification Number:	MM61 - 64	Paragraph:	216 - 227	Policy:	S19	Map:	
---------------------------	-----------	------------	-----------	---------	-----	------	--

2. Do you consider the Main Modification makes the Development Plan Document legally compliant?

Yes		No	X
-----	--	----	---

3. Do you consider the Main Modification makes the Development Plan Document:

Sound		Unsound	X
-------	--	---------	---

If you have selected unsound, do you consider it:

(1) has not been positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements	
(2) is not justified – the plan is the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.	
(3) is not effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.	
(4) is not consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.	X

4. Please give details of why you consider it to be unsound, not legally compliant, or why you support it. Please be as precise as possible.

<p>Concerns surrounding the proposed policy approach centre around the proposed minimum separation distance of 800m between any turbine (with a greater tip height than 25m) and the nearest residential property.</p> <p>Separation distances between turbines and residential properties are not considered appropriate by past or present national planning policy or guidance. Indeed the current Renewable and low carbon energy guidance note (Planning Practice Guidance, online, last update 06/03/14) states;</p> <p><i>“Local planning authorities should not rule out otherwise acceptable renewable energy developments through inflexible rules on buffer zones or separation distances. Other than when dealing with set back distances for safety, distance of itself does not necessarily determine whether the impact of a proposal is unacceptable. Distance plays a part, but so does the local context including factors such as topography, the local environment and near-by land uses. This is why it is important to think about in what circumstances proposals are likely to be acceptable and plan on this basis.”</i></p>

Based on this guidance, a specific distance, whatever its length is not advocated by national policy or guidance. Policies for renewable energy generation should set a positive framework for renewable energy technologies and should not rule out proposals based on standard distance based policies which have no scientific basis.

Based on the above, it is considered that the policy and modification is unsound and not in accordance with Government policy.

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested wording of any proposal or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Removal of the distance criteria from the policy.

(Continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

Signature:	Neil Foxall (signed electronically)	Date:	24/03/2014
------------	-------------------------------------	-------	------------