



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 13-16 and 20-21 July 2010

Sites visit made on 16 and 21 July 2010

by **Elizabeth Fieldhouse** DipTP DipUD
MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
20 September 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/A/10/2125093

Land north of Draughton Harrington, Draughton, Northamptonshire NN6 9PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Nuon UK Limited against the decision of Daventry District Council.
- The application Ref DA/2009/0168, dated 19 February 2009, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2010.
- The development proposed is the construction of a 7 wind turbine farm and its associated infrastructure, which includes control building and hardstanding around control building (0.06ha), crane pads (0.56ha), turbines (4.43ha), new/upgraded access roads (2.6ha) and met mast (0.01ha).

Procedural matters

1. Since the application was refused planning permission, at the Committee meeting on 31 March 2010 the Council resolved to withdraw the reason for refusal that related to the effect on the setting of nearby scheduled ancient monuments and nearby grade II* listed church. The Council's remaining reason for refusal related to the impact on the setting of the group of nationally significant Thor missile launch pads and their associated remains.
2. By email dated 17 May 2010 the appellant confirmed that, due to a review of operating procedures, the meteorological monitoring mast would no longer be required as part of the proposed development. Consideration of the proposal has been on this basis.

Decision

3. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

4. Having had regard to the reason for refusal and all the other matters raised, the main issues in this appeal are:
 - whether the proposed development would be harmful to the setting and thereby the significance of the Thor missile launch pads and their associated remains;
 - the effect of the proposal on other heritage assets;
-

- the effect of the development on visual and residential amenity particularly in respect of the impact on the landscape including any cumulative impact with other wind farms, safety, noise and vibration, and shadow flicker;
- the implications of the proposal for the ecological and nature conservation value of the site; and
- whether any harm identified would be outweighed by the benefits of the development.

Reasons

Policy background to renewable energy developments

5. The raft of Government documents from the Energy White Paper, Meeting the Challenge May 2007 to the July 2009 Renewable Energy Strategy leave no reasonable room or dispute regarding the seriousness of the climate change and its potential effects, the seriousness of the need to cut carbon dioxide emissions or the seriousness of Central Government's intention regarding deployment of renewable generation.
6. The key principles in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 22 *Renewable Energy* published in 2004 include the provision that renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic, and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily (key principle i). The wider environmental and economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy projects are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining proposals (key principle iv). Key principle (vi) advises that small-scale projects provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy and to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally; with key principle (viii) advising that development proposals should demonstrate any environmental, economic and social benefits as well as how any such impacts have been minimised through careful consideration of location, scale, design and other measures.
7. Since the publication of PPS22 there have been several publications that make up the national energy policy with the Renewable Energy Strategy of July 2009 identifying that wind generation both onshore and offshore has an important role to play in the provision of renewable generation in the UK. The EU Renewable Energy Directive requires the UK Government to ensure that at least 15% of energy consumed comes from renewable sources by 2020 whereas at present only 3% of consumed energy comes from renewable sources.
8. PPS7 *Sustainable Development in Rural Areas* published in 2004 post dates PPS22 and in paragraph 16(iv) provides that, when preparing policies for local development documents and in determining planning applications for development in the countryside, local planning authorities should provide for sensitive exploitation of renewable energy sources in accordance with the policies set out in PPS22. Government statements of planning policy are material considerations that must be taken into account.

9. The Daventry District Local Plan 1997 (LP) predates the Government policy referred to above and does not contain a specific policy in respect of renewable energy. Therefore the weight to be attached to the Government policy should be increased. In relation to sites of historic/archaeological importance LP policy GN2 (F) provides that proposals will normally be granted provided it will not adversely affect sites of nature conservation, geological or archaeological importance or the setting of archaeological sites.

The proposal

10. The proposal involves the siting of 7 wind turbines on a plateau in an area of gently rolling mainly agricultural landscape interspersed with villages and isolated dwellings. The northern boundary of the site is about 350m south of the A14, with the B576 defining the eastern boundary which also forms the boundary between Daventry District and Kettering Borough. Access would be from the road that links the village of Draughton and the B576 that lies to the south of the appeal site. The land falls away to the west into the valley through which the Brampton Valley Way passes. From the edge of the appeal site, the village of Draughton is approximately 0.7km to the south, Harrington about 1.2km to the north and Maidwell approximately 0.7km to the west.
11. Two public footpaths CN1 and CN2 generally run north south through the centre of the site with bridleway CN4 bisecting the eastern side of the site partly sited on one of the former taxi/runways of RAF Harrington. The Brampton Valley/Mid Shires Way runs along the disused railway line in the valley but is outside the site. Minor watercourses cross the western side of the site and there are a small number of permanent and semi-permanent ponds and a larger reservoir surrounded by trees towards the centre of the site.
12. The site is predominately in agricultural use but the eastern half was the former World War II airfield RAF Harrington. Between the late 1950s and 1963 part of the former airfield, generally to the east of the bridleway was used for the siting of Thor missiles that formed part of the Cold War defence in the east of England.
13. Turbines 3 and 7 would be sited to the east of the bridleway with turbines 1 and 6 to the west of the bridleway and the remaining three sited on the land that begins to fall away towards the Brampton Valley Way. The turbines would be 86m high to the hub with a maximum rotor diameter of 90m and an overall maximum height to the tip of the blade of 126.5m. In addition there would be a control building 10m x 20m and 4m to ridge that would be to the east of the bridleway and have its own associated hardstanding. In this area the temporary construction compound some 100m x 100m would be accommodated. Each of the turbines would have their own hardstanding and be accessed from tracks that link back to the main access that would be along the route of bridleway CN4.

The setting of the Thor Missile site

14. The former Thor missile base from the Cold War period was identified as being of national importance in the English Heritage survey of Cold War Monuments in 2000 and put forward for possible scheduling being one of the only four remaining of the original 20 Thor missile complexes. Although Harrington is considered to be the best preserved it had not been scheduled at the time of

the inquiry but the parties agreed that it is a designated historic asset and would fall within paragraph 5 of the Introduction to Planning Policy Statement 5 *Planning for the Historic Environment* (PPS5) and the definition of a heritage asset in annex 2 to PPS5. PPS5 policy HE9.6 advises that the absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate lower significance and they should be considered subject to policies HE9.1 to HE9.4 and HE10 that refer to designated heritage assets.

15. The Environmental Statement volume 1 submitted with the application at paragraph 11.4.16 acknowledges that the Thor missile launch pads are of national importance and are of high sensitivity. The Thor missile complexes were part of the Cold War defence between 1959 and 1963 and acted as part of the Western nuclear defences with that at RAF Harrington a satellite station that housed three Thor missiles under the control of RAF North Luffenham.
16. The site at Harrington comprises the concrete remains of the three launch pads including blast walls together with, in two cases, the remains of the long-range theodolite buildings. Other supporting infrastructure still in evidence are the substantial E-shaped earthwork warhead compound which retains remains of the classified storage building and the pyrotechnics building, the concrete foundations of the launch control area and diesel tank support structure and the foundations and remains of the administrative buildings. Originally the whole had been within a fenced compound. The remains are within the agricultural landscape and on private land but are visible as stark angular shapes from nearby roads and footpaths and as small blocks in more distant views.
17. PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide provides in paragraph 113 that the setting to a heritage asset is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced and that all heritage assets have a setting irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. The guide goes on to indicate that setting is generally more extensive than curtilage and may be influenced by other factors including spatial associations and the historic relationship between places. The elements of the whole Thor missile complex are not linked today as former roads and/or runways have been dug up and replaced by agriculture. Nevertheless, the elements of the base that were housed within a secure polygon shaped compound are evident and a proper understanding of the function of the base requires elements to be conceived together. Therefore I consider that the extent of the Thor missile site within the secure compound provides the minimum setting for the site so that the significance, interrelationship between elements and arrangements of the site can be fully appreciated.
18. The missiles were located here because of the infrastructure from the former RAF Harrington base and the siting away from centres of population with the Thor compound making use of existing concrete runways. Therefore it is possible that the former airfield forms part of the setting. In my opinion, the setting is more extensive than the curtilage of the three launch pads and as indicated in the Practice Guide to PPS5 the perceived extent of the setting may change as an asset and its surroundings evolve or as understanding of the asset improves. In relation to RAF Harrington the former layout and runways are evident in aerial photographs and the history of its usage by the Carpetbaggers is preserved in the Carpetbaggers' Museum to the north of the

proposed turbines with the Memorial to the Carpetbaggers to the east of the appeal site on the other side of the B576 but overlooking the airfield and the Thor Missile site.

19. Wind turbines are large structures that, while the blades are well above ground level, have a sizeable width at ground level to support the height of the structure and associated blades. Even with the rotating blades well above ground level, turbine 3 sited between the launch pads and warhead compound would unacceptably harm the understanding of the asset and the historic relationship between the parts. In addition, the control compound and sizeable building would be sited adjoining the former runway near the warhead compound and within the former secure compound, diluting the historic relationship between the three launch pads and the necessary warhead compound.
20. Turbine 7 would appear to be outside the former secure compound but well within the former airfield between what appeared from aerial photographs to be two runways or taxiing routes. This would conflict with the essence of the choice of setting for the missiles on the former RAF Harrington base. Enough of the former airfield remains to convey a sense that the Thor missile base deliberately re-used the former airfield. Both turbines 3 and 7 as well as the control building complex would harm unacceptably the immediate setting and interrelationship of the component parts of the Thor missile site and destroy the current spatial and visual relationship between the components and any understanding of the base as an integrated complex in the context of its historic design and operation. The scale of the turbines both the diameter of the mast structure and the overall height and sweep of the blades would dwarf the Thor missile site and interrupt views within and without the site. The missile site would lose its impact as the most dominant form of development on the former airfield and become subservient to the wind turbines and control building thereby making the historic landscape more difficult to contextualise and unacceptably diminishing the experience and appreciation of the site.
21. In the wider context turbines 1 and 6 would be prominent from the missile site and form a dominant element in views over the former airfield from the memorial, harming the undeveloped landscape setting that continues to express the historic isolation of the Thor missile site that contributed to the selection of the site. Nevertheless, the remaining three turbines would be sited on land that slopes away from the plateau and, in my opinion, would be far enough removed from the Thor Missile site as to not harm the setting of the site, being towards the background of views over the airfield from the memorial. The scale of those turbines would be offset by the wider landscape from all views towards the Thor missile complex other than from the west on the other side of the Brampton valley from where the Thor missile emplacement blast walls are just visible above surrounding crops. The siting of turbines 1, 3, 6 and 7 as well as the control building would harm the setting of the historic asset contrary to LP policy GN2(F).

Other heritage assets

22. There are 110 identified listed buildings within 5km of the nearest turbine, 7 of which are listed grade I, 13 listed grade II* and the remainder grade II, with 3 scheduled ancient monuments as well as three conservation areas also within

5km. Within 15km there are 10 historic parks and gardens on the English Heritage Register plus the park and garden around Kelmarsh Hall. The proposed turbines would in some instances be visible in views of, and/or from some of the heritage assets but the wider views do not generally form the setting of the heritage asset. St Catherine's Church, Draughton (originally of concern to the Council) is not significant for its presence within the wider landscape having a fairly squat tower but because of its age and form at the centre of the village on raised ground within a small churchyard that provides its setting. I do not consider that the church would be dominated by the turbines because of distance and intervening planting. Although the wind farm would form part of the wider landscape within which the existing heritage assets would be perceived, the proposal would not erode the heritage assets as none to the assets appeared to be contributed to by the land on which the wind farm would be sited.

Impact on visual and residential amenity

- *Landscape considerations*

23. The topography of the area is gently undulating lying on the eastern side of a gentle valley bisected by a tributary of the River Nene with the area forming part of the clay Sywell Plateau. The land gently rises from approximately 110m AOD to approximately 160m AOD. The predominant usage is for agriculture with the land not subject to any specific designation. Wind turbines of the scale proposed are likely to give rise to significant landscape and visual effects. It is accepted that the Zones of Theoretical Visibility offer a fair and reasonable representation of the geographical extent of potential theoretical visibility but actual visibility is likely to be less extensive due to factors like woodland and built form not included in the theoretical model.
24. The appellant accepts that in views up to 0.7/0.8Km from the wind turbines they are likely to be dominant, up to 2.5km away significant effects would theoretically arise from the turbines, and between 2+ and 5km away, assuming open viewing positions with no intervening structure or vegetation, the turbines would be relatively prominent/clearly apparent. Beyond these distances and up to 15kms away turbines are likely to be apparent but becoming incidental and beyond 15km they would be likely to be incidental becoming akin to no change. Nevertheless the visually permeable nature of the development would result in landscape being viewed and appearing to flow around the turbines into surrounding landscape.
25. There would be the perception of a change to the existing landscape character of an area that residents value but the openness and scale of the rolling lowland agricultural landscape would offset the scale of the turbines that would not appear incongruous in the wider landscape. Precise distances do not fully reflect the impact on the ground from the turbines as there may be features that affect the landscape character and perception of the turbines including the topography, other features and the nature of visibility. Nevertheless, the distances of radial influence of turbines is a useful guide to the changes to the landscape character that would result from the proposal.
26. The Environmental Statement identifies 33 properties within a 3km radius of the application site. The turbines would be visible from the upper floors of a

number of properties and from some gardens but due to the orientation of the properties there are few principal ground floor windows that would have direct views particularly when intervening vegetation is taken into account. The effect of turbines on individual properties would depend on the number, size and proximity of the turbine to the property and therefore whether the turbines would be unpleasantly overbearing and an unavoidable presence when viewed from the house and garden. From properties that would be at the edge of the area where the wind turbines would be dominant, views are likely to be filtered or obscured by intervening vegetation and/or have no principal line of sight in the direction of the turbines.

27. From Draughton Heath, a dwelling that recently had the benefit of a two storey rear extension on its northern side and is sited some 0.88km from the nearest turbine, the western line of turbines could be intrusive and appear stacked as a result of the removal of garden planting. Nevertheless, there appeared to be principal habitable room windows in the western elevation and the garden amenity space was mainly to the south and west of the dwelling and screened such that any views of the turbines would be filtered. Suitable planting on land within the appeal site could further filter views from the ground floor of the rear extension.
28. The appellant indicates that Museum Bungalow and Sunnyvale Farm are 0.7km from the nearest turbine but they are separated from the proposed development to the south by a substantial treescape. Subject to adequate landscape screening, which can be required by condition, no property would come to be widely regarded as an unattractive and unsatisfactory place to live as a result of the proposal. Having fully assessed all the evidence both in writing and orally, I consider that the wider landscape and the living conditions of local residents would be changed but not harmed unacceptably.
29. In relation to the amenity from footpaths and bridleways, the turbines would generally be sited outside a 200m buffer zone for bridleways (as advised in the Technical Annex to PPS22 Companion Guide *Planning for Renewable Energy*) and more than the overall height of the turbine away from public footpaths. The British Horse Society Advisory Statement on Wind Farms advises that 200m should be seen as the minimum and suggested greater distances but the Society did not comment on the appeal proposal. Conditions could ensure that the routes of public footpaths nearer the turbines are stopped up and alternatives provided during construction, but as turbine 6 would be within the buffer zone for footpath CN1 that should be permanently diverted. Turbines 3 and 7 would just be within the 200m buffer zone of the public bridleway. A 126.5m high to tip of blade wind turbine would appear dominant to pedestrians and riders on the footpaths or bridleways but, with adequate separation, there would not be unacceptable harm except potentially from turbines 3 and 7 that would be within the advised separation distance from a bridleway.
 - *Cumulative impact*
30. Cumulative visual effects concern the degree to which renewable energy development becomes a significant or defining characteristic of the landscape and the degree to which renewable energy development becomes a feature of particular views. Studies in the Environmental Statement demonstrate that there would be no cumulative and visual effects from existing or approved sites

at the time of the inquiry although there were other sites under consideration particularly that at Kelmarsch which, if permitted with the appeal site, would result in a greater sense of a change to the landscape for those travelling through the area. Nevertheless, at the time of the inquiry, if the wind farm at Harrington were permitted, there would not be any significant cumulative effects with the existing and permitted wind farm developments.

- *Safety*

31. There is local concern about the safety of the turbines but the Companion Guide to PPS22 advises that properly designed and maintained wind turbines are a safe technology and that blade failure is most unlikely. In the event of a fall over, the guidance suggests that the height of the turbine to the tip of the blade plus 10% is often used as a safe separation distance. All turbines would be that distance away from footpaths as existing or as proposed to be rerouted, a factor that could be required by condition.
32. The Ministry of Defence high pressure oil pipeline crosses the site and is a potential hazard to safety if breached. Nevertheless, all the turbines would be further from the pipeline than the minimum separation distance of 1.5 x hub height, the closest turbine being some 140m from the pipeline. The Oil and Pipelines Agency advise that the position of the wind turbines in respect of the oil pipeline is acceptable and I heard and have read nothing to justify me taking a different view.
33. Residents were concerned that the sudden appearance of the turbines from the A14 near its junction with the A508 could cause a danger to highway users. The Companion Guide to PPS22 advises that drivers are faced with a number of varied and competing distractions during any normal journey, and are therefore required to take reasonable care. The advice goes on to indicate that wind turbines should therefore not be treated any differently from other distractions nor be considered particularly hazardous. I have found nothing to make me take a different view in this case.

- *Noise and vibration*

34. The Council do not raise issue in respect of noise but there are understandable concerns from local residents that the proposal could result in unacceptable levels of noise. Wind farms should be located so that any increase in ambient noise levels around noise sensitive developments are at acceptable levels in relation to existing background noise levels. Paragraph 22 of PPS22 provides that the DTI Report *ETSU-R-97 The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms* (ETSU) should be used to assess and rate noise from wind energy developments. It provides a methodology designed to ensure that a balance is struck between the impact of noise from turbines and the need to ensure satisfactory living conditions for those who might be exposed to it. The guidance recommends that noise levels be limited to 35-40dB(A) or 5dB(A) above background whichever is the greater in the daytime and 43dB(A) or 5 dB(A) above background noise levels whichever is the greater at night at the nearest noise sensitive properties. This is calculated to offer a reasonable degree of protection to wind farm neighbours. The noise limits suggested by the appellant for inclusion in a condition were either the prevailing measured background level plus 5dB(A) or the fixed ETSU limits whichever is the greater.

35. The appellant carried out the necessary survey following the thrust of the ETSU guidance between 9 and 30 October 2008 with additional monitoring at two locations in May/June 2010. The data taken represent only a snapshot of the weather conditions throughout the year but demonstrate a range of noise levels and wind speeds from those much quieter than the ETSU recommendation to some that would be greater. Due to the limited amount of data collected the results should be treated with a degree of caution. However, the noise limit, having regard to the ETSU minima levels and the results of the survey, can be controlled by condition which would link acceptable noise levels to measured wind speeds.
36. It was found from the noise data collected in 2010 in Maidwell that the background noise level was not comparable with any of the initial five survey points. It was considered that additional survey work was necessary so that ambient noise limits could be set for Maidwell. This could adequately be required by condition. With conditions attached to ensure that maximum ambient noise levels related to background noise levels are not exceeded, and subject to the additional survey work in order to set levels for Maidwell, ambient noise levels from an operational wind farm as proposed would not be unacceptably harmful.
- *Amplitude Modulation (AM) or 'blade swish'*
37. The Hayes McKenzie report *The Measurement of Low Frequency Noise at Three UK Wind Farms 2006* links AM to stable atmospheric conditions and high wind shear and noted that AM can result in internal wind farm noise levels which are audible although the noise associated with the wind farm was not found to awaken the occupant. The 2007 report into *Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise* found that amplitude modulation (AM) was not generally a factor in noise complaints. The Government has decided that there is currently no competing case for further research about it and that ETSU-R-97 should continue to be used, adequately addressing AM without the need for a condition. There was no evidence to convince me to take a different view.
- *Shadow Flicker*
38. The Companion Guide to PPS22 advises that rotating wind turbine blades can cast moving shadows which under certain conditions cause flickering. The report on shadow flicker in the Environmental Statement concludes that the theoretical duration of shadow flicker at windows of the affected properties would be low. Shadow flicker would only occur when the turbines are operating and the climatic conditions are such that a shadow is cast. It has been found elsewhere to be likely to be on no more than 30% of the maximum potential in the summer and about 15% in the winter. It is possible to prevent shadow flicker by measures ranging from planting tree belts between the affected window and the turbines, installing blinds at the affected windows or shutting down the turbines during periods when shadow flicker could theoretically occur.
39. Shadow flicker is only found to occur within properties up to 10 rotor diameters of a turbine and within 130 degrees either side of north at these latitudes in the UK. Therefore potentially there could be shadow flicker at Sunnyvale Farm and Foxall Cottages. It is possible to provide a mitigation strategy to prevent harm from shadow flicker and a condition could be imposed that would require

the protocol for a scheme including remedial measures should they be necessary. It would then be open for the Council to take enforcement action should the remedial measures not be implemented and operated in full.

Ecological and nature conservation value

40. PPS9 *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation* includes the objective to conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England's wildlife with PPG22 advising that the impact of a wind farm on the local ecology should be minimal. LP policy GN2(F) advises that development will normally be permitted provided among other points, that it does not adversely affect sites of nature conservation importance. From survey it was found that there were populations of Noctule/Leisler's bats with a flight path between Kelmarsh Woods and the reservoir that could conflict with turbine 4. It was suggested this could be mitigated by shutting down turbine 4 at appropriate times. For the residents, there was concern that some of the surveys were in cold weather when bats would not be flying due to lack of insects and that more than one turbine may be in the Noctule bat flight line. The appellant acknowledges in correspondence with Natural England that additional surveys were necessary to determine the precise times and dates for a shut down of the turbine to prevent harm to the bats and this could identify flight lines. Initially the shut down of turbine 4 between dusk and dawn from mid April to mid October could be required by condition.
41. In respect of birds, the appellant's survey identified that the site supports a number of breeding farmland birds of nature conservation importance including the common skylark and yellowhammer as well as a pair of barn owls and other birds including raptors. In the winter the area is visited by flocks of Eurasian golden plover and Northern lapwing. Arable fields that are visited are widely available in the surrounding area although the appeal site is reported to be the highest land in the area. Residents are concerned that bird migration paths and birds that fly at night would be adversely affected. The Environmental Statement, having methodically assessed the risks to birds in the locality, concludes that the proposal would not give rise to significant or unacceptable effects on ornithological interests. A view endorsed by Natural England and other organisations. There was no formal study to justify me taking a different view.
42. A habitat management plan could be required by condition that the appellant indicates would include bat boxes and the enhancement of two areas of semi-improved grassland. With a suitable habitat management, monitoring and the shutting down of turbine 4 during an appropriate period pending the result of further survey, the ecological and nature conservation value of the appeal site would not be harmed unacceptably.

Overall Balance and conclusions

43. Government policy takes seriously climate change and its potential effects, the need to cut carbon dioxide emissions and the deployment of renewable energy generation. There is a strategic need for renewable energy provision in the UK to assist in tackling climate change and to ensure the security of energy supply with significant weight attached to the environmental benefits. The proposal may only provide a small percentage of the renewable energy requirement but each wind farm development would be important in incrementally contributing to meeting the target.
44. Conditions could overcome some of the identified harm in all issues other than the effect on the Thor missile complex. The proposed turbines would not have any direct physical impact on the actual Thor missile installation remains but as I have found would impact harmfully on the setting of the remains and visually break up the linkages of the components of the site. The area now has the appearance of a modern agribusiness rather than a former World War II airfield and/or a site for missiles during the Cold War. The appellant has proposed a Heritage Enhancement Plan that would include a full record and survey of the remains, stabilisation and maintenance of the remains, and signage/interpretation boards both on and off site. A condition could also require the retention and preservation of the Thor remains during the lifetime of the wind farm. The Heritage Enhancement Plan would increase the awareness and understanding of the remains for the general public. There was already some interpretation in the Carpetbaggers' Museum and I am not convinced that the development, which would break up the perceived linkages between components of the Thor missile complex, would be the only method of securing interpretation or the future of the Thor missile site remains.
45. The harm to the setting and interrelationship between the components of the Thor missile site, particularly as a result of turbines 3 and 7 and to slightly lesser extent turbines 1 and 6, would be such that it should outweigh the environmental benefit of the proposal. Once lost the setting of the Thor missile site would be unlikely to be restored even though the proposed development would be for a limited period of 25 years. As policy HE9.1 of PPS5 advises the significance of a heritage asset can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. The harm to the interrelationship between the parts of the Thor missile installation and the setting of the missile site could not be overcome by conditions and would be so significant as to outweigh the environmental benefits.
46. Other appeal decisions referred to by various parties are material but do not provide a precedent or justification for or against the appeal proposal which has been determined having regard to Government policy, the development plan and all material considerations. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mark Beard
Of Counsel instructed by Sharpe Pritchard
Solicitors, Elizabeth House, Fulwood Place,
London WC1V 6HG

He called
Dr Ben Robinson BSc MA
PhD
Nigel Ozier BA(Hons)
MRTPI
English Heritage Inspector and Team Leader,
East Midlands Region
Managing Director, Brian Barber Associates

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Richard Glover
Solicitor and Partner at Hammonds, 2 Park Lane,
Leeds LS3 1ES

He called
Robert Bourn BA MA
MIFA
Elizabeth Stephen BA
MSc
Tony Stones BSc MSc
MIEEM
Nigel Mann BSc MSc
MIOA AMIEMA
Dr Rossa Donovan BSc
MPhil PhD MIEEM
Jeffrey Stevenson MA
MPhil DipEconDev,
CMLI, MRTPI,
MInstEnvSci, FRGS
John Dickinson
BSc(Hons) DipTP MA
MRICS
Director, CgMs Consulting
Associate Director, Historic Buildings Team, CgMs
Ltd
WYG Environment Planning Transport
Associate Environmental Scientist, WYG
Environment Planning Transport
Regional Director for Ecology, WYG Environment
Planning Transport
Jeffrey Stevenson Associates Ltd, Environmental
and Landscape Planning
Regional Director (Planning), Leeds Office of
WYG Environment Planning Transport

FOR THE RULE 6 PARTY:

Prof. David Unwin
For Say No to Harrington Wind Farm Action
Group

He called
Mrs M Duke
Mr McMahan
Mr Skittall
Wind farm specialist for CPRE Northamptonshire
and Chairman of BLOT wind farm action group
Bat Consultant

Mr Richardson MA
Mrs A Wall
Dr Hickey

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr B Cadbury	
Mrs C Cadbury	Chairman Harrington Parish Council
Mr T Oglethorpe	For Orton Parish Council
Mrs Sanders Hewitt	For Maidwell with Draughton Parish Council
Mr F West	Secretary Harrington Aviation Museum Society
Mr J Hornett	Northamptonshire Green Party
Mr H Eppel	Pro Wind Alliance
Cllr P Booker	District Councillor
Ms V Turner	
Mr P Turner	
Mrs S Jackson Stop	
Mrs K James	
Mr D Parton	For Old Parish Council
Mrs K Calnan	
Mr R Smeaton	For Maidwell and Draughton Parish Council
County Cllr C Miller	
Mr J Twidell	

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Notification letters
- 2 Rebuttal Proof – John Dickinson
- 3 Rebuttal Proof – Robert Bourn
- 4 Rebuttal Proof – Dr Donovan
- 5 Rebuttal Proof – Nigel Mann
- 6 Rebuttal Proof – Tony Stone
- 7 Letter from Mr West – Sec. Harrington Aviation Museum Society
- 8 Rebuttal Proof – SNHWF Action Group
- 9 Rebuttal Proof – Phil Richardson
- 10 Paper 015.2 European Union Wind Energy Conference 20-24 May 1996
- 11 Uncertainty of WASP AEP predictions (EMD)
- 12 Some lowland Turbines and their Load Factors
- 13 British Horse Society Statement – Wind Farms April 2010
- 14 CV of Paul Francis AIFA
- 15 Dept of Energy & Climate Change – Energy Statistics 24 June 2010
- 16 Revised Statement of Common Ground July 2010
- 17 Draft Conditions
- 18 Opening Statement on behalf of Nuon UK Limited
- 19 Opening Statement on behalf of Daventry DC
- 20 Opening Statement by the SNHWF Action Group
- 21 Letter dated 11 July 2010 from Caroline James
- 22 Statement by Grahame Jordan of the Pro Wind Alliance
- 23 Letter dated 1 July 2010 from Anne and Ron Block
- 24 Email dated 12 July 2010 from Nigel Lingley
- 25 Letter dated 6 July 2010 from Dr Tom Day
- 26 ‘Why a Wind Farm at Lissett Airfield?’
- 27 Statement by Melanie Duke
- 28 Photographs referred to by Mrs Duke
- 29 Extract from Telegraph travel shop
- 30 Statement by Mrs Cadbury

- 31 Statement by Mrs Sanders Hewitt
- 32 Statement by Benedict Cadbury
- 33 Copy of presentation by Dick Bowdler 'Towards Integrated Noise Management'
- 34 Draft Noise Conditions
- 35 Initial SNHWF Suggested Short Tour - site visits
- 36 Statement by Cllr Pamela Booker
- 37 Rebuttal – Phil Richardson
- 38 Sgurr energy – Onshore wind energy consultancy Services and track record
- 39 Locations and directions of photographs contained in Rob Bourn's proof
- 40 East Midlands Regional Landscape Character Assessment
- 41 8A: Clay Wolds of Regional Landscape Character Assessment
- 42 Harrington and Thorpe Underwood Village Design Statement
- 43 Statement by Victoria Turner
- 44 Statement of Mr Oglethorpe
- 45 Statement of Mrs Jackson Stop
- 46 Statement of Mrs K James
- 47 Statement of Mr D Parton
- 48 Statement of Kate Calnan
- 49 Statement of County Cllr Chris Millar
- 50 Statement of Kevin O'Connor
- 51 Proof of Evidence of Prof. John Twidell
- 52 Draft conditions on public rights of way
- 53 Draft condition identifying applications drawings
- 54 Annotated draft conditions (originally doc 17)
- 55 Appeal Statement APP/Y2810/A/10/2120332
- 56 Draft additional condition
- 57 Site visit route
- 58 Closing statement for SNHWF Action Group
- 59 Closing submissions on behalf of Daventry DC
- 60 Closing submissions on behalf of Nuon UK Limited

PLANS

- A Application plans

PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1 Visualisations for SNHWF Action Group