

Matter 12 – Strategic Wind Turbine Developments

Policy CC4

Issue 1 - Whether the proposed sites at Brenda Road and High Volts are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

The Inspector notes that there are considerable volumes of representations both for and against the proposed strategic wind turbine development area at Brenda Road. The vast majority of these representations use standard template contents but have been treated as separate representations. The Inspectors questions focus on the key points raised in these submissions and the relevant national policy including the content of Written Material Statements. It is noted that the Council has provided a comprehensive response on representations to Policy CC4 within the Consultation Statement (document HLP01/4).

Q1 What is the rationale for the proposed sites? Is it economic strategy, a reflection of demand/interest from the industry in these sites and a need to manage development consistent with national policy, part of a Borough commitment to addressing climate change or a combination of all of these factors?

[It will be interesting to see the council's response to these questions.](#)

Q2 The Plan clearly identifies that the landscape evidence led to the identification of additional capacity at High Volts. The CPRE (representation Pub0074) submit that the Arup Study does not support development of the proposed scale proposed at High Volts. What is the justification for the additional scale of turbine development at this location? Hartlepool Local Plan Examination 2017

Matters, Issues & Questions - Version 1.0. 07 August 2017

Q3 In relation to Brenda Road, what is the evidence to support the identification of this particular area? Have alternative locations for strategic wind turbine developments been considered south-east of Hartlepool?

[What are the proposed benefits of having wind turbines developed close to residential and commercial properties? Who benefits?](#)

Q4 Is seven wind turbines with a potential installed capacity of 2MW each an appropriate basis on which to consider Policy CC4? Is the evidence clear that this would be the maximum number of turbines? [Understand this has been reduced to 4 turbines which is still unacceptable to the community I have attached a noise report commissioned by the residents of Seaton Carew this was in relation to the 3 giant turbines that were called in and rejected due to inadequate consultation. The feelings on this matter have not changed.](#)

Q5 Is wave and tidal technology a serious or viable renewables sector to develop or host in the coast off Hartlepool? Have there been proposals? Does the Plan directly or indirectly support off-shore renewables including the potential for tidal schemes?

[When I asked this question at the meeting it was left unanswered. I would have thought the council could work with Universities studying these renewable energies to see if this is viable.](#)

Q6 The Planning Practice Guidance⁹ refers to community backing and this is reflected in the wording of Policy CC4. In this context is community backing necessary for the identification of suitable areas in Plans or is it specifically a criteria when considering development proposals?

The majority of the residents in Seaton Carew are against these proposals, when discussing with residents some residents believe it is not worth fighting the council as they will do what they want without consideration of the residents.

Some residents are totally against turbines as they believe there are uneconomic and actually adding to the cost of utilities, others are in favour but believe the turbines should be offshore and not within a 5 mile radius of residential property. We believe there is a legal requirement to have community backing for such proposals.

9 Paragraph: 033 Reference ID:5-033-150618

Q7 In respect of the proposed site at Brenda Road, what does the level of community comment (both for and against) indicate in terms of whether Policy CC4 proposal at Brenda Road would be deliverable? Consequently, would the policy be sound, in terms of being effective?

The majority of the residents in Seaton Carew are against these proposals, when discussing with residents the vast majority of residents believe it is not worth fighting the council as they will do what they want without consideration of the residents.

Some residents are totally against turbines as they believe there are uneconomic and actually adding to the cost of utilities, others are in favour but believe the turbines should be offshore and not within a 5 mile radius of residential property.

In the case of those who are pro wind turbines in the plan our understanding is that this has tended to be from people outside of Seaton Carew who have not been privy to the full information on the location of the turbines but focused more on been pro green energy, which the majority are in favour of this, but not in such close location to residential and commercial property. Certainly the vast majority of those who supported the 3 previous applications came from outside of the immediate area affected.

Q8 Has it been satisfactorily demonstrated that on-shore wind turbine structures can be accommodated at Brenda Road without significant adverse impact on residential amenity and the amenity of those employed in the Southern Business Zone (primarily relating to noise and flicker)?

Do not believe that a truly independent report has been produced to assess these areas properly, this should not be generic it should be a detailed study of the affected area/s together with a study of local health potential impact. Surely there is a duty of care by the council to produce this before incorporating into a town plan, without such supporting evidence it makes the soundness of this proposal questionable as community backing cannot be demonstrated. As mentioned earlier I have attached a noise report that was produced on behalf of Seaton Carew residents.

An analogy of this would be someone asking me to act on faith where a potential hazard is present without providing the correct personnel protective equipment. The general view is that the council is attempting to sanction there turbines without proper investigation and fully understanding potential risks and associated costs.

Q9 What would be the harm to local character? In what visual context do the turbines need to be considered?

Need to be considered from all angles and how they will impact on the horizon. The Seaton Carew Masterplan states that approaches to Seaton Carew should be improved, so this appears to be a contradiction. In addition the potential impact on the Seaton Carew Conservation Area and listed buildings within it needs to be assessed.

Q10 Is there evidence that the Brenda Road proposal would 'sterilise' or inhibit employment proposals within the Southern Business Zone? Conversely, is there evidence that wind turbines at this location could have a positive impact on employment and businesses in the area?

In relation to employment there would be initial employment for installation of the turbines which would be provided by specialists more than likely from outside of the area, then maintenance of turbines, which would be minimal over the term.

There is no mention of the exit arrangements that would be in place if the turbines were to be agreed and I would see that as a fundamental arrangement to ensure the turbines were decommissioned and disposed of in a suitable manner.

My thoughts on incoming industries is that they would not like to take the risk of developing a business which may detrimentally impact on their business and employees.

Q12 The area for Policy CC4 at Brenda Road washes over general employment land at Policy EMP3g and land for specialist employment at EMP4e. Is that deliberate and does it

At the meeting I attended it did not appear that much thought had gone into the development of this land.