



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 16-26 August, 20-21 December 2011 and 23 January 2012
Site visits made on 20-21 September 2011

by Paul Jackson B Arch (Hons) RIBA

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

Decision date: 9 March 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/A/11/2146394

Land west of Bicton Industrial Estate, Kimbolton, Cambridgeshire

- 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 Broadview Energy Developments Limited against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 1001201FUL, dated 19 July 2010, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2011.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 4 No. wind turbines, up to a maximum tip height of 125 metres high, together with associated crane pads, access tracks, site compound, ancillary works, control building, meteorological mast and access to public highway.
-

Preliminary matters

1. Individual turbines are referred to in this decision as T1- T4. The orientation of the individual elevations of Kimbolton Castle follows the convention used by the parties; the east front contains the main portico and the west elevation faces the gatehouse and the town of Kimbolton.
2. In addition to the accompanied site visits in September I carried out extensive unaccompanied visits on 3 May, 15, 19 and 22 August and 21 December 2011 in the surrounding countryside and around Grafham Water.
3. A pre-Inquiry meeting was held on 30 May 2011. 'Rule 6' status was granted to the Stop Bicton Wind Farm group (SBWF). At this meeting, I was advised of the existence of a planning application for 4 wind turbines and associated infrastructure at Whitleather Lodge, Woolley Hill, Ellington, approximately 7 km from the appeal site. A Regulation 19 request was subsequently made for the visibility implications of this scheme to be taken into account in the ES. This information was provided for the Inquiry. At the time of writing, this scheme is the subject of a separate planning appeal.
4. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the Inquiry adjourned for a period between August and December. At the resumption, a further adjournment was necessary after the first day and the Inquiry adjourned to be resumed on 23 January 2012. There was insufficient time for closing submissions to be made orally on the last sitting day. With the agreement of the parties, closings were submitted in writing on 30 January and 6 February 2012 and published on the Council's website. The Inquiry was closed in writing on 7 February 2012.
5. On 20 September, the appellant company erected a 'blimp' on the intended position of T3. On 21 September, the blimp was raised as close as possible to

the intended site of T1 on the adjacent concrete access track. This was because of poor ground conditions due to rain the previous night. Because of the wind speed on both days, the blimps did not reach the full height of the proposed turbines. However they provided a useful guide to location and visibility. The base of each turbine was also marked with a pile of straw bales wrapped in a white sheet.

6. The planning application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999, as amended. Following a request by the Council under Regulation 19, supplementary information was provided in response to comments from English Heritage (EH), and the Council's Conservation Officer and the Council's Environmental Health Officer. This was subject to consultation.
7. During the first adjournment, English Heritage issued *The Setting of Heritage Assets* which provides advice on managing change within the settings of heritage assets, to assist implementation of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 5 *Planning for the Historic Environment*. The parties were given an opportunity to comment and I have considered the appeal having regard to those submissions.
8. During the first sitting days of the Inquiry and at the site visit, inaccuracies were pointed out in some of the ES landscape and Cultural Heritage (CH) viewpoints and the Kimbolton cricket pitch visualisation. The appellant undertook to audit these and provide revised and updated visualisations where the positions of turbines were out of alignment by more than one degree or were incorrectly shown, in a way which could be misunderstood. Revised images were circulated in early December 2011. The cricket pitch visualisation was updated subsequent to hearing evidence on that subject. I have considered the appeal proposal on the basis of these updated images together with comments made at the later sessions and my own assessment of the visual impact on the ground.
9. The first reason for refusal advises that the ES is incomplete on the grounds that there is insufficient information to allow proper assessment of the environmental impacts on cultural heritage because 7 of the 9 requested photomontages (designated CH1-CH9) had not been provided. These concerned the experience and setting of a number of Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings. Further environmental information including an additional CH viewpoint was provided at the Inquiry by the appellant and the SBWF provided their own CH visualisations, prefixed AH. There is agreement that the additional visual material provided at the Inquiry fills the gaps perceived by the Council and the SBWF.

Decision

10. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

11. The main issues are as follows:

- The effect of the proposed development on the landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding area;

- Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kimbolton, Tilbrook and Stonely Conservation Areas;
- The effect on the setting, architectural character and historic interest of listed buildings at Grade 1, II* and II; and
- Whether the environmental and economic benefits of the scheme would be sufficient to outweigh any harm that might be caused.

Reasons

Policy considerations

12. The development plan so far as relevant to this appeal comprises the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England (RSS) published in 2008, the Huntingdonshire Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 (CS) and saved policies of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 1995, updated by the Local Plan Alteration adopted in 2002 (LP).
13. The RSS provides broad planning strategy for the East of England up to 2021. It is the Government's clear intention to revoke Regional Strategies outside London as soon as possible, including the RSS, subject to the outcome of environmental assessments. However, RSS policies address the need for renewable energy in eastern England based on current national policy, particularly the *Planning and Climate Change* Supplement to PPS1 and PPS22 *Renewable Energy*.
14. Regional targets are provided in RSS policy ENG2. The objective is that 10% of the region's energy (excluding offshore wind) should come from renewable sources by 2010, increasing to 17% by 2020. The most recent figures contained in the *East of England Renewable Energy Statistics* show a substantial shortfall against the 2010 target for on-shore wind and an ongoing supply deficit that is not disputed. Other evidence was presented on the substantial contribution to be made by the Tilbury Biomass plant, but this is scheduled to close in 2015, and in any case is not a wind power installation. Statistics were provided from the Department for Energy and Climate Change on operational, consented and proposed wind farms. Whilst this deserves careful scrutiny, the potential output for Bicton was incorrectly shown. I give it only very limited weight in any argument that there is not an ongoing shortfall in the region.
15. Policy ENV6 of the RSS requires planning authorities and other agencies to identify, protect, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the buildings, places and landscapes which make up the historic environment of the region. In similar vein, policy ENV2 seeks the protection and enhancement of the diversity and local distinctiveness of the region's countryside character areas.
16. Policy CS1 of the CS requires all development to contribute to the objective of sustainable development. In achieving this aim, criteria include maximising the opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy sources and preserving and enhancing the diversity and distinctiveness of Huntingdonshire's towns, villages and landscapes including the conservation and management of buildings, sites and areas of architectural, historic or archaeological importance and their setting. The policy expressly states that proposals for renewable energy will need to take into account the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on wind power. Huntingdonshire Council adopted the SPD *Wind Power* in

2006. It is based on research carried out by LUC consultants that was published in 2005 in *Wind Turbine Development in Huntingdonshire*. The SPD is not itself part of the development plan; its purpose is to assist the interpretation and application of those policies concerned with landscape character and the location of renewable energy schemes. It provides a starting point for decision making, advising that local variations in character will need to be considered in relation to proposals. Whilst it could not have taken account of the latest renewable energy targets, its adoption is relatively recent and it provides the most useful and relevant guidance on the relative landscape sensitivity and turbine capacity of different areas in Huntingdonshire.
17. The reasons for refusal refer to policies C3, E1 and E3 of the Development Management Development Plan Documents Proposed Submission 2010 (DPD). They are not adopted but on hold. They were approved by the Council in February 2010 and have been through consultation; as such, I give them some weight. So far as renewable energy is concerned, they are consistent with PPS22. C3 advises that proposals for free-standing renewable energy generating schemes that are in accordance with PPS22 will be considered favourably where careful siting and design ensures the scheme does not have an unacceptable impact, both in isolation or cumulatively with other similar developments, on the environment and local amenity. The siting and design should have regard to the capacity of the surrounding landscape as identified in the SPDs *Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment* adopted in 2007 (HLTA) and *Wind Power* referred to in CS1.
18. DPD policy E1 concerns the development context and requires that proposals demonstrate consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding environment and the potential impact on the distinctive qualities of the landscape as identified in the HLTA, avoiding the introduction of harmful, incongruous or intrusive elements by reason of the development's siting and scale. DPD policy E3 indicates that a development which may affect a heritage asset or its setting should demonstrate how the asset would be protected, conserved and where appropriate enhanced. A proposal will not be permitted if it is likely to cause significant harm to a heritage asset. This policy pre-dates, by a short period, national advice in PPS5. Lastly, DPD policy H7 seeks the safeguarding of the living conditions of residents.
19. The relevant policies of the LP were saved in 2007. Policy En2 requires that any development involving or affecting a building of special architectural or historic interest has proper regard to the scale, form, design and setting of that building. Policy En5 on conservation areas seeks to preserve or enhance their character or appearance by, according to the explanatory notes, ensuring that the scale, design, materials and layout of new development blends with the established character of the area. Policy En9 advises that development will not normally be permitted if it would impair important open spaces, trees, street scenes and views in and out of conservation areas. These reflect the statutory duties in legislation but are now ageing and in interpretation, need to be read alongside later Government guidance in PPS5. No LP policies address wind power or renewable energy.

The site and its surroundings

20. The proposed site for the wind turbines lies on a former WWII airfield in west Cambridgeshire north of the town of Kimbolton. The airfield is now open, mainly flat agricultural land used for arable cropping with large scale fields with

few hedged boundaries, though there are some small copses of trees. There are scattered farms and isolated dwellings in the countryside surrounding the site and a large poultry enterprise at Blackwell Farm. Bicton Industrial Estate occupies an area formerly used for airfield buildings east of the road between Kimbolton and Stow Longa, a village on the northern edge of the old airfield about 1 kilometre (km) from the nearest turbine. The proposed control building and construction compound would be accessed from a gateway near here. Another village, Catworth, lies further to the north west about 3 km away. The land falls to the south west of the site into the valley of the River Kym in which Kimbolton and another village, Tilbrook lie.

The effect on landscape and visual amenity

21. The landscape character of the area has been assessed on a national, county and district basis. The site lies within National Joint Character Area (JCA) 88 *Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands* which consists of a broad sweep of lowland plateau divided by a number of broad shallow valleys. Kimbolton is mentioned as a small yet distinguished modest settlement and for its notable 'castle' as the final home of Catherine of Aragon. The East of England Regional Assembly study *Placing Renewables in the East of England* of 2008 identifies the JCA as having low-medium/medium sensitivity to commercial turbine development; sensitivity increasing by the variety of scale in some parts of the area. The maximum size of wind farm suggested is medium/large or between 4 and 24 turbines, though the study emphasises that the more sensitive the landscape, the smaller the wind farm typology needs to be in landscape and visual terms before its character is significantly affected. A landscape with 'low-medium sensitivity' is defined as having characteristics of landscape character that are resilient to change and may in many situations be able to accommodate wind energy development without significant change in landscape character.
22. The HLTA SPD formed part of the evidence base for the CS. Looking at the landscape at a smaller scale than the JCA, it identifies the 'Northern Wolds' as a sub-character area. This is a broad north-south strip extending from the Nene valley to the north to the western side of Huntingdonshire, including the appeal site and most of the town of Kimbolton at its southern tip. This area has a strong topography of ridges bisected by pronounced valleys, the valleys being well vegetated and intimate in scale, whilst the plateaux are more open. Distinctive square church towers topped with spires stand out on the horizon and form landmarks visible from long distances. As such, this study indicates that the area is relatively unspoilt and generates a very positive response from visitors, being regarded as amongst the most attractive countryside in the district. It advises that a key issue is the protection of views towards the distinctive skyline of ridge tops, church towers and woodland.
23. The Northern Wolds merges into the 'Southern Wolds' sub-character area to the north and east of Kimbolton. This is a transitional area between the Northern Wolds and the Ouse valley and has a more gentle topography. It contains Grafham water, a large artificial reservoir.
24. The *Wind Power* SPD provides information on the relative sensitivity and capacity of the district's landscapes in relation to wind turbines and indicate criteria that need to be taken into account in considering proposals. It is not a definitive statement on suitability of any site and is intended to set out a positive approach to guide development, bearing in mind the national

commitment to increasing renewable sources of energy. The Northern and Southern Wolds are identified as having a high capacity for a small scale group of 2-3 turbines. The Northern Wolds has a low capacity for a group of 4-12 and above whereas the threshold in the Southern Wolds is set higher, having a high capacity for a group of this size.

25. Amongst more detailed guidance in the SPD is the advice that the key sensitivities of the Northern Wolds include the more intimate valleys, historic villages and church spires. It says that a small scale group of turbines should, amongst other things, respect the landform and relate turbines to the strong ridges and plateaux; avoiding locating turbines within the more intimate landscape of the valleys and along valley crests where they will be out of scale with the landscape and settlements such as Kimbolton; and respecting the site and setting of the historic villages. Turbine development should not affect the perception of the landscape which is highly valued for its unspoilt quality and harmonious character. At the Inquiry, there was a debate about what 'crest' means where, as in this case, there is frequently a gradual change between ridges, plateaux and valleys. I consider the word should be understood in its normal sense as the top part of something that slopes or rises upwards. Thus a slope would have a distinct horizon, the position of the crest possibly changing depending on the position of the viewer.
26. The SPD adds that a small group of 2-12 turbines¹ could respond well to the ridge and plateau topography and open arable land but there is very little scope for the Northern Wolds to accommodate more than one small-scale group. In this regard, there are no other turbines operating or under construction in the Northern Wolds, though other proposals are under consideration. A scheme for 4 turbines at Woolley Hill would be about 6/7 km away at the eastern edge of the Northern Wolds character area on the opposite side of the Ellington valley. Another proposal at Molesworth airfield would be on the same ridge as Woolley Hill, a slightly greater distance to the north west of Kimbolton.
27. Detailed advice in the SPD for the Southern Wolds is that a group of 2-12 turbines could respond well to the landscape structure and pattern but that a key sensitive element is the wooded skyline afforded by the ridge between the valleys of the Kym and Ellington Brook. This should not be cluttered by numerous tall vertical structures and should remain a predominantly rural, wooded feature.
28. The site lies towards the edge of the broad ridge between the Kym valley and that of the Ellington Brook at one of its widest points, where the former airfield is about 40-45 metres (m) in elevation above Kimbolton. There is a strong sense of openness on the broad plateaux seen from viewpoints in a wide arc from the north west, going eastwards round to the south east, where the land descends gradually on a more wooded ridge to Grafham Water which lies between 2 encircling arms of this higher ground. In long distance views on the plateaux, it is sometimes difficult to perceive the existence of the valleys that divide. From parts of the ridge to the south west near the county line with Bedfordshire, the Kym valley merges between the gentle undulations. I consider that this type of wide landscape has many of the attributes that suggest a lower sensitivity to wind farm development. In many of the longer

¹ Unexplained discrepancies between the definition of ranges of turbines in groups are a feature of the earlier research and the adopted SPD, but are of no great moment in respect of this proposal.

views, all the proposed turbines would appear in a former airfield landscape of relatively large scale, together with some existing large groups of buildings such as Bicton Industrial Estate and the Blackwell Farm poultry unit. In this context and from many viewpoints on the plateau, they would be acceptable in their effect on landscape character. T1 and T3 in particular would be within the plateau of the airfield, away from where the slope of the land changes in a pronounced way as it descends into the valley. They would not occupy a significant proportion of views appreciated by those enjoying the plateau landscape for leisure purposes or journeying across it.

29. However, at the western edge, the Kym valley is a strong contrasting form. Without any particularly obvious linear features such as pylons, major roads or railways, and having a more vegetated appearance with smaller fields and more habitation, it contrasts markedly with the open, flat uplands above it. Kimbolton and to a lesser extent, Tilbrook lie at points in the valley where it narrows slightly and this can be perceived from further up the valley to the north west, but is probably most frequently experienced and understood seen from the B660 road from Catworth. Going south, this road breaches the crest of the valley at Bustard Hill, turns and then traverses the slope downwards to Kimbolton which first appears as a distinct settlement amongst trees, flanked by the valley sides and punctuated by the steeple of St Andrews Church. From here and from many other viewpoints looking over the Kym, T4 and the anemometer mast would be seen to be at the edge of the valley. T2 would be firmly on the upper part of the gently sloping side, as demonstrated by reference to the figured contours and the corrected photomontage 23b. Both would be dominant features, straddling the valley crest.
30. Seen from below, the height of these 2 turbines and the anemometer mast would be reinforced by the land sloping up towards them. From much of the valley floor, most of the height of T1 and T3 would be visible beyond the crest, rising out of a different, unseen environment, their bases out of sight. Nevertheless all 4 turbines would form a conspicuous group several times the height of the valley itself. The full height of T2 and most of the structure of the other 3 turbines would be visible from a large part of the valley including some lower lying land such as near to Vicarage Farm and Wornditch Hall.
31. The most obvious significant and noticeable vertical features in the existing landscape are the spires of St Andrew's church at Kimbolton and All Saints at Tilbrook which would both be about 1.7km away from the nearest turbines. These buildings are visible from much further afield due to their significant height and as such are still landmark structures, albeit not on high ground. Whilst not comparable in visibility terms with similar spires in high plateaux and hilltop villages, they still perform the same function as a community focus and as a goal for travellers. They are glimpsed over the edge of surrounding higher land, their full extent becoming clearer on descending into the valley, in much the same way as spires on high ground are gradually revealed on climbing out. Even as stationary objects, the turbines would compete with and diminish their significance, seen in many views but particularly from Castle Hill and Park Farm to the south; and from Tilbrook, the B645 along the valley floor and footpaths rising up to Honeyhill Wood to the west. In the foreshortened view of the valley side from the opposite western slopes, the turbines' precipitous siting would be particularly clearly perceived behind the spire of Tilbrook church. Moving blades would add significantly to a marked distracting and alien impact in an area of recognised landscape quality.

32. The proposed turbines would inevitably be large structures with significant landscape effects, but they would not unacceptably disrupt existing open views across plateaux and from one ridge to another. However, I conclude on this issue that they would appear unsympathetically located and conspicuously out of scale in relation to the intimate and sensitive Kym valley landscape and the settlements therein. The chosen locations of T2 and T4 are directly contrary to the advice in the SPD. I conclude on this issue that the development would significantly conflict with the aim of preserving and enhancing the diversity and distinctiveness of the landscape set out in policy CS1 of the CS.

The effect on conservation areas and listed buildings

33. There would be neither direct effects on the fabric of the listed buildings nor any development within any conservation area. The potential impact of the development on heritage significance would be limited to their settings. *The Setting of Heritage Assets* defines setting as the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. It embraces all of the surroundings in which the asset may be experienced or that can be experienced from within the asset.

Kimbolton

34. The Kimbolton Conservation Area encompasses the older centre of Kimbolton, together with the castle grounds extending to the south east as far as Park Lane. It is described in adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) of 2002 *Kimbolton Conservation Area Character Statement*. Despite its age and limited scope, the SPG remains accurate in its general description and summary of the heritage value of the conservation area. It also identifies principal views and interesting vistas. The castle, now a school, is a Grade I listed building rebuilt by Sir John Vanbrugh in classical style in the 18th century. It is a prominent feature in the town and in many views of the settlement. Together with the separately listed 1764 gatehouse (also Grade I listed) by Robert Adam in a planned composition, it is a strong focal point, indeed the central feature in the conservation area, at the eastern end of the wide High Street.
35. St Andrew's church is also listed at Grade I and is a distinctive building with a high tapering steeple at the western end of the High Street where the B645 through the town describes a pronounced 'S' bend. The main part of the historic town lies between these two prominent buildings which are at the heart of the settlement. The great majority of the buildings facing the High Street and many others in the parallel East Street and in Carnaby, north of the church are Grade II or Grade II* listed. Although now extended on the west and north sides by much 20th century housing, the historic core of Kimbolton remains largely unaltered. Mature trees, particularly tall wellingtonia, add interest to the character of the conservation area. It is a settlement of very significant heritage value.
36. The castle and church have strong historical, cultural and economic links with each other and the town centre. Because of the inter-relationship between the conservation area and the listed buildings, I consider all these assets in this section of the decision. I concur with the character assessment where it advises that the open space of the castle grounds is very important to the setting of the castle and the wider character of the town, as are the views offered out into the surrounding landscape. There are a great many historical maps that demonstrate the evolution of Kimbolton and these indicate that the

original park associated with the castle has varied in size. Over the years, formal gardens south of the castle have been removed and parts of the estate returned to farmland. The grounds of the school now only extend over parkland to the east and south of the castle but the estate once also included much of the valley. Rising land to the north, where the turbines would be situated, was never, as far as can be established, in the parkland, but forms an agricultural backdrop. Nevertheless it is seen in important views across the castle grounds and over the roofs of the town from several identified vantage points and contributes to their settings.

37. The fact that modern high structures such as turbines might be visible in the same view as listed buildings or would be seen from, towards or across a conservation area does not necessarily make them unacceptable. The nature, extent and level of the heritage significance of the asset has to be considered and the degree to which development would enhance or harm that significance, or whether it would have a neutral impact, assessed. The effect (and its visual impact on residents and visitors) can be objectively analysed and then an element of judgement applied.
38. The turbines would be to the north on higher ground just under 2 kilometres away from the west entrance to the castle. They would not be easily seen from the main easterly approach because of the landform and intervening trees, but they would be visible to the side of the south and east elevations, in varying numbers, from a large part of the grounds. Some of these views include the 2 Grade I buildings and in addition, separately listed Grade II* listed steps up to the east portico (VPs AH1, AH2, AH3). The anticipated visible height of T4 could be assessed at the site visit from the attachment points on the temporary anemometer mast which is in a similar location. From some places towards the south east part of the grounds, the blades of T4 and probably other turbines would be visible turning over the castle roof. Towers, hubs and blades would be seen from the cricket pitch in front of the south elevation of the castle, from some positions appearing directly above the Robert Adam gatehouse. I consider that the turbines would be modern, elevated, intrusive features in the countryside to the north seen from many parts of the grounds that would be difficult to avoid in appreciating the setting of these buildings and the town.
39. The gatehouse is lower than the castle, level with the roofs of many of the listed buildings in the High Street. Because it is designed to relate to the castle and is on the same symmetrical axis, additional significance attaches to the historic townscape which can be seen between and over the two buildings and which substantially defines their interrelated setting. This consists of an attractive roofscape comprising a variety of tiled and slated surfaces at various pitches including many chimneys, complemented by and given scale by the dominant church spire.
40. Because of the relative levels, much of the height of the turbine towers on the crest of the valley and the anemometer mast would appear to a viewer looking northwards to grow out of the town roofs in an uncomfortable and anachronistic juxtaposition, despite being beyond the settlement. In some views which would change as the observer moved around, including the south front of the castle, the gatehouse and the informal roofs of the town, T2 and T4 would be seen directly behind the porticos, important symmetrical architectural elements of the gatehouse, distracting from their composition and relationship with the town on one side and the castle on the other. The moving blades

would appear as a significant modern intrusion, because of their contrasting scale, appearance and movement, in this highly sensitive historic environment; and would seriously distract from and diminish the ability to appreciate and enjoy its significance. The fact that Lewis Hall, a utilitarian 20th century school building, also intrudes into some views from further round to the west does not mitigate the harmful effect that would occur.

41. These views are not normally available to the public but that does not attract significant weight; the contribution that setting makes to significance does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. Even so, the grounds and cricket pitch are used by the many staff and pupils of the school. The castle is not a private estate, is a significant visitor attraction and its historical association with Catherine of Aragon is celebrated. It is open to the public twice a year. In many ways it defines the town historically, architecturally and culturally.
42. It is accepted that there is no 'designed view' or key vista which would be affected. What is of most concern is that modern turbines would be so prevalent in views and so frequently seen in conjunction with these heritage assets that they would be impossible to avoid. The historic setting of these assets has been experienced by those moving in and around them largely without 19th and 20th century influence thus far. The revolving turbines would significantly erode and diminish that experience.
43. From the interior of the castle, it would be possible to see turbine blades from seats in some classrooms and from important rooms on the west front including the chapel and the boudoir. From windows in the upper storeys, turbines would be seen in conjunction with the roofscape of the town but not in close juxtaposition as they would be in views from the surrounding grounds. From the interior of the upper floors, the contribution of the gently sloping hillside to the setting of Kimbolton is better appreciated, and the fact that 2 of the turbines would be located on the crest of the valley; but very little would be readily seen unless the observer went to a window and made a conscious effort to look out and to the side. Mature evergreen trees help to restrict views of the hillside. The countryside in which the turbines would be situated that can be seen does not form part of a designed landscape associated with any outlook from the castle. I consider the degree of harm to views from the interior to be only moderate.
44. Turning to their visibility from the centre of the town, the turbines would not be seen from much of the High Street due to the height of the surrounding buildings. However, many of these are also dwellings with 2 or 3 storeys and I cannot discount the likelihood that many occupiers would have a clearer view of the turbines than might be apparent from ground level. They would be visible over the same historic roofscape and would distract from it.
45. Towards the western edge where the High Street turns northwards around the church, VPs K and L, as corrected, indicate that the hubs and moving blades of all the turbines would be visible behind the town over the roofs of listed cottages, to a greater or lesser extent depending on the time of year. The hubs of T3 and T4 (the closest at about 1.7 km) would be more visible than those of T1 and T2. The support structures or towers of the turbines would not be easily seen, but blades and hubs would interrupt the skyline over the roofs of the historic cottages in Carnaby and nearby trees. In these views the road is the dominant feature and traffic would also be a modern distraction.

Because of the close proximity of the church and the number of listed buildings around it that contribute to its setting, there would be a moderate degree of harm caused here.

46. The surrounding countryside provides a dished valley setting in which the Kimbolton conservation area forms an attractive focal point accentuated by the spire and the castle projecting above the trees. The turbines would only be seen together with the town in views from the valley sides from the north west, anticlockwise round to the south. Two footpaths ascend Castle Hill, a ridge in the western slope, across part of the former estate, which is undesignated historic parkland. One passes through the school grounds to Park Lodge past a 12th century motte, a scheduled ancient monument and the site of the first castle in the area. It is elevated to command a view over the valley and the turbines would be a conspicuous modern feature seen from here, but would be well to the north of Kimbolton, only occupying a modest part of a wide arc of view. Notwithstanding the detrimental impact on the landscape character of the valley, the setting of the conservation area would not be significantly affected.
47. The turbines would be visible from parts of Kimbolton cemetery, a planned Victorian cemetery and an undesignated historic asset near the north eastern edge of the settlement. The cemetery is a quiet place of reflection and contemplation, aided by the existence of many mature trees and an attractive approach across a bridge over the river. It has an intimate scale and is separated from the surrounding residential areas by heavy masonry walls. The turbines would mostly be visible, in part, from the area furthest to the north east. They would be a conspicuous feature to some visitors in this area but would be well outside the main central cemetery environment. I consider that they would not be so imposing or so dominant as to seriously distract from or diminish the experience of visitors or mourners.

Tilbrook

48. Tilbrook village lies approximately 1.5 km to the north west of Kimbolton in the centre of the valley. The conservation area includes the Grade I listed All Saints Church at its centre together with surrounding meadows and a small number of isolated buildings including the Manor House, listed grade II*. The approach to the church along Church Lane is included and this is lined on one side with cottages. There is currently no character assessment. I consider that the character of the conservation area derives from its loose-knit strongly rural nature in which the surrounding fields extend into the heart of the village where a spacious graveyard surrounds the church. The listed buildings and other houses are important references to agricultural development in the area over the centuries.
49. The nearest turbines would be T2 and T4 around 1.5km away. From the centre of the conservation area around the church, views would be confined to moving blades, hubs and parts of towers in varying proportions depending on tree cover in the line of view. The church yard is intimate in character with many intervening bushes and trees and the turbines would be seen to be in the countryside beyond; however the surrounding undeveloped fields form an important extension of the tranquil quality of the conservation area and the listed church within its parish at the centre of the rural community. The impact would be major and adverse because of the dominant modern industrial character of the turbines which would be higher than the surrounding valley

sides and out of scale with them. The effect would be magnified because T2 would be clearly situated on the side of the valley, T4 would be on a slight outcrop alongside the anemometer mast and T1 and T3 would be just beyond the edge of the landform; the whole development straddling the crest of the valley and significantly changing its character.

50. People moving through the settlement on the many footpaths that cross this conservation area would have a more marked experience of the change that would occur, because the turbines would be an ever constant feature of the setting of all the historic assets in the village. This would be especially noticeable descending the footpath from Spanoak Wood to the south, in which the steeple dominates the surrounding village roofs and farmland. Prominent above field boundary planting or in the case of T2, fully visible on the slope, the turbines would rise high above the crown of the curved undulating edge of the valley, contrasting markedly in scale. Approaching Tilbrook from the north along the B645, turbines would become visible after Manor Farm in a prominent position on the valley crest and to the dynamic observer, gradually pass over the top of Tilbrook itself and its church, occasionally coinciding with the steeple (VPs CH7, AH6A & B). The turbines on the crest would have a major adverse impact on the setting of the Tilbrook conservation area.

Stonely

51. The Stonely Conservation Area encompasses a ribbon of intermittent development along the B645 south of Kimbolton mainly on the east bank of the Kym. It includes about 17 listed buildings at Grade II. The character statement published in 2003 draws attention to the importance of the integration between landscape and settlement evident in the area, evident in the close picturesque relationship between meadowland and the historic dwellings visible along the road. The wind farm would be visible from parts of the valley looking north, north west over fields but would be well over 2 km away. The bases of the towers would not be visible. There would be no significant adverse impact on this conservation area or its setting.

Other heritage assets

52. Warren House is a 'folly', listed at Grade II*, built as a 'vista' building facing Kimbolton park in the late 18th century. It lies on the northern axis of the castle about 1 km away on the side of the valley. It forms an important focal point seen from the castle and is being restored. It is flanked by relatively recent tree plantations that reinforce its symmetrical siting relative to the castle and contribute to its setting. The former Stonely Priory cottage, listed Grade II, lies south of this building. Both occupy land once part of the parkland of the castle, but the turbines would not significantly impinge on the setting or the heritage significance of either of these buildings.
53. There are no other historic assets in the locality that have settings that would be seriously affected by the proposed turbines. Policies HE9.1 and HE10.1 of PPS5 indicates that the heritage significance of an asset can be harmed through development within its setting. In this case, there would be a loss of significance due to conspicuous turbine development within the countryside surroundings which contribute to the settings of Kimbolton Castle, the Gatehouse, the entrance steps and those of the Kimbolton and Tilbrook Conservation Areas. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kimbolton or

Tilbrook Conservation Areas and would harm the settings of important listed buildings, conflicting with the heritage protection aims of policy CS1. However, whilst considerable, the adverse impact caused would be reversible. There would remain areas in which the turbines would not be seen. The harm caused would not be so serious or severe as to be considered 'substantial harm' in terms of PPS5. As such it falls to be considered under policy HE10.1, where the harm needs to be balanced against the wider benefits of the proposal.

Other matters

Living conditions- outlook

54. Whilst not reasons for refusal, local residents raise many other matters of concern. Around 7 dwellings lie within 1 km of the proposed turbines. A much larger number exist within 2 km of the turbines, including houses in the Newtown area on the northern side of Kimbolton. Site visits were carried out to all the dwellings within 1 km and those within 2 km likely to be most affected.
55. Advice in the PPS22 Companion Guide for wind energy projects affirms the basic principle that 'The planning system exists to regulate the development and use of land in the public interest. The material question is whether the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the locality generally, and on amenities that ought, in the public interest, to be protected'. In terms of visual amenity, this translates into the long established principle that there is 'no right to a view', meaning that it is not possible to protect a property simply on the basis that an attractive or cherished view would be adversely affected by development. My former colleague Inspector, David Lavender, in his Enifer Downs (North Dover) decision, expressed it in this way: '..... when turbines are present in such number, size and proximity that they represent an unpleasantly overwhelming and unavoidable presence in main views from a house or garden, there is every likelihood that the property concerned would come to be widely regarded as an unattractive and thus unsatisfactory (but not necessarily uninhabitable) place in which to live. It is not in the public interest to create such living conditions where they did not exist before.' This test is one way of describing the situation where private and public interests could coincide in such a way that the outlook from a dwelling would be so harmed as to be generally regarded as unacceptable. Whilst a helpful approach, each development has to be looked at on its own individual merits.
56. I deal with the properties in groups or individually as appropriate, having regard to the information provided by the appellant and the occupiers and the particular circumstances of each, starting with those nearest the turbines. All residential properties are categorised as being receptors of high sensitivity. In analysing the potential effects, however, a significant visual effect does not necessarily mean that it is unacceptable; much depends on the individual circumstances, such as orientation, tree cover or landform.
57. Cobwebs and Vicarage Farm: these 2 dwellings lie between about 761 and 778m from the site of T2. The appellant's Residential Visual Amenity Survey (RVAS) identifies a substantial magnitude of change with a major effect. These properties would have clear views up to T2 and T4 on higher ground from the rooms on the road frontage. T1 and T3 would be visible behind. The view would be more restricted from the ground floor level of Cobwebs due to a boundary hedge and trees on the opposite side of the road. Trees in the

forecourt of Vicarage Farm would partially obscure some turbines from some windows. The angle of view, that would theoretically encompass all 4 turbines, would mean that from most places within the interior of habitable rooms, the view to the outside would include at least one turbine, sometimes 4. Hedge and field boundaries would mitigate the visual impact of the towers to some extent, but moving blades would be a varying and prominent feature on the skyline. T1 would be on the highest ground and despite being furthest away over the crest, would frequently be the most prominent by virtue of being in direct line of sight with least obstructions. T2 and T4 would be on the crest with the new anemometer mast.

58. The turbines would substantially alter views out to the north east for the occupants of both houses. The main living area and principal bedroom of Vicarage Farm have a dual aspect with another view over the garden to the south west, providing spacious and well lit spaces. Despite this, it would still be difficult to avoid the visual impact of the turbines almost directly in line with the north east facing windows. The turbines would be in constant view from the study from its single window and from other rooms. However, views over the garden and countryside from the other 3 elevations which include single storey wings would remain substantially unaffected and the main outside recreational areas would be on the opposite south west side, from which the turbines would not be easily seen, except possibly blade tips from the furthest areas. The turbines would introduce a substantial change with harm arising from the combination of the largely uninterrupted short distance to the development and the angle of view to the north east in which the turbines would appear oppressive to the occupants; but these houses would not become unacceptable places in which to live.
59. Rookery Farmhouse lies outside Stow Longa at about 846m from T3. There would be unrestricted views of all the turbines from ground and first floor windows and the main garden facing south west, which would occupy about 32 degrees in horizontal extent. There would be no intervening planting of any significance. However, although the house has windows on all sides, the turbines would only be a feature from some windows to habitable rooms, the main windows to the lounge facing north west and south east. Whilst there would be a significant effect with harm to the outlook from the garden and limited accommodation areas, the turbines would not be unacceptably overbearing and the house would not be a significantly less attractive place to live.
60. Avalon and Station Masters Cottage lie within the same group as Rookery Farmhouse but slightly further away. Due to existing farm buildings, orientation and tree cover, there would be only restricted views of parts of turbines. There would not be an unacceptable impact on the outlook for the occupiers.
61. High View House lies just within the 1 km line from T2 on the broad plain to the north west of the site, just off the B660 near the top of Bustard Hill. The view from the main living area and rear garden would frame the group of turbines between a side wing of the building and trees. Because of this characteristic, despite occupying a narrower angle of view than from some other properties, the turbines would represent a major change in circumstances for the occupants who would have no means of avoiding, in practical terms, a very significant alteration in their rural outlook from the rear of their house on 2 floors of habitable rooms. The south easterly aspect from the garden would be

dominated by turbines. Moreover, the main view from here (and also experienced by travellers passing southwards on the B660) includes the broad spread of the Kym valley including the steeple of St Andrews Church and the tall trees which define the settlement of Kimbolton. The turbines would appear conspicuously perched on the edge of the valley where it changes from flat plain to incline, mentioned earlier in the consideration of landscape matters. The particular circumstances of this property and the way in which the view of turbines would be enclosed and framed by buildings and trees lead me to the conclusion that there would be a significant adverse impact on outlook. However, the distance to the turbines would mitigate the impact to the extent that the dwelling would not be an unacceptable place in which to live.

62. The occupiers of other properties along the B660 and Molly Rose Lodge to the north would be aware of the existence of the turbines but because of the combination of orientation, tree cover and boundary planting, outlook would not be unacceptably affected. The existence of the Kym valley is not easily perceived from these properties and the turbines would be more appropriately seen in the flat plain landscape evident here, aided by large agricultural and industrial buildings that contribute to a very different sense of scale.
63. The Lodge lies on the 1km line at the top of Bustard Hill where Station Road descends from a junction towards Tilbrook. Many of the windows to habitable rooms face away from the proposed turbine site. A bank of mature trees and mixed hedging would largely obscure views of the turbines from the garden and a conservatory. Although the turbines would be more visible in winter, the effect on the occupiers would not be unacceptable.
64. 65 Station Road: This property lies towards the bottom of the valley towards Tilbrook about 1.4km from T2. The eastern elevation is close to the field boundary. The garden, a conservatory and windows to a kitchen and bedroom benefit from a wide open aspect up across Bustard Hill towards the turbine site. The turbines would form a relatively compact group seen from here and although directly in the line of view, would not seriously compromise enjoyment of the property as a whole. The main lounge windows face in a southerly direction and would not be affected. However from here, as on Bustard Hill, the position of T2 and T4 and the anemometer mast would be seen to be straddling the valley edge in the same view as the valley bottom, with the concomitant harm to landscape character identified earlier.
65. The Newtown area of Kimbolton lies just outside the 1km radius from T4 near the foot of the hill on Stow Road. Houses at the edge of this 20th century estate environment benefit from a rural view across arable fields and several would have direct views of turbines from habitable rooms and gardens to varying degrees. Corrected visualisation A1b of November 2011 shows that only parts of T1, T2 and T3 would be visible due to the intervening landform and these would be seen as being over the crest from this position (although T2 would actually be on the valley slope, a projecting ridge prevents this being perceived). Most of T4 would be prominent on the hill, but it would occupy only a moderate part of the overall view which would retain its essential rural characteristics. The enjoyment of the occupiers of their properties would not be seriously harmed.
66. To the north of the turbine site, occupiers of dwellings on the edge of Stow Longa would have a clear view of turbines, T1 being just over 1km away. All the turbines, which would be in a well defined group, would be seen in the

context of the broad plateau landscape that pertains in this area. Views of turbines would be mitigated to some extent by trees and field boundary planting, particularly at Ringleton, one of the nearest and most affected properties. For some residents, the turbines would represent a substantial change which would be hard to avoid because the predominant outlook is towards the south west. The impact would be significant, but it would not be so serious that the dwellings would become unattractive and thus unsatisfactory places in which to live.

67. There would be a change in outlook for many local occupiers, and the quality of the view would be reduced to an extent by the introduction of wind turbines, but I do not consider that the effect on the amenity of most local residents would be so overwhelming, that their concerns should weigh heavily against the scheme. However there would be a more marked adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Vicarage Farm and High View House, in terms of outlook. Whilst not so great as to make these houses unacceptable places to live, this matter needs to be brought into the planning balance.

Living conditions- noise

68. There is no reason for refusal relating to the level of noise from the proposed turbines, the Council considering that an unacceptable level of noise can be dealt with using planning conditions. However, local residents have objections to the likely noise impact of the development. The Government's chosen method of assessing noise from wind farms, ETSU² seeks to achieve a level of noise which is reasonable and which would allow the nearest neighbours acceptable living conditions. What it does not seek to do is reduce wind farm noise to a level which would be inaudible to local occupiers or that no-one will ever be disturbed by it. The number of complaints relating to existing wind farms is comparatively few and has reduced as the technical aspects of turbines have been better understood; if there is a persistent problem, it seems likely that levels would be far higher.
69. I visited the noise monitoring locations (NMLs) used and accept that they represent the amenity areas of the dwellings concerned for baseline noise survey purposes, with one proviso. It is hard to understand why the NML at Vicarage Farm was placed in a fairly restricted area of garden planting at the rear of the adjacent house, Cobwebs, in close proximity to hedges and trees. It seems likely that measurements here would have been affected by wind passing through leaves and foliage to an extent that the true level of background noise may not have been properly recorded. However, the rear gardens of both these properties are on the opposite side of the dwellings from the turbines and the road. This matter does not weigh significantly against the proposal.
70. Residents draw attention to the potential for excess amplitude modulation (AM, or blade swish). On 13 December 2011 the SBWF group presented, for the first time, a paper prepared by the Renewable Energy Foundation (REF) dated 31 October 2011. I allowed the appellant and the Council time to respond to it, in writing. I have taken all these representations into account but find that the evidence that an excess level of AM would occur, to the extent that local occupiers would be unacceptably troubled by it, is not persuasive. With conditions attached to ensure that maximum noise levels related to background

² The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms: Energy Technology Support Unit (ETSU) September 1996

are not exceeded, I consider that the degree of noise and disturbance caused by the appeal development would be acceptable.

Cricket

71. Following the issue of the revised visualisation provided in January 2012, T3 would be at an angle of around 18 degrees to the centre line of the west wicket and at a slightly greater angle to the east wicket. Having regard to that and the distance to the nearest turbine of about 1.6 km together with the intended position of the turbines at a significantly higher ground level, I do not consider that the existence of moving blades would be likely to distract batsmen or any other player to the extent that cricket would become difficult to play or unenjoyable; or that audiences or rival teams would be put off attending matches. In considering this matter, I have taken account of other distractions that can occur from time to time and are likely on a rural pitch, such as flying birds and moving vehicles on the nearby road. The turbines would not move across the ground as these might; and would be in an area of sky sufficiently far away from the bowlers arm to prevent any misunderstandings as to the flight of the ball. This matter does not significantly weigh against the scheme.

Wildlife and other concerns

72. I have taken account of all the other matters raised including a wide range of other concerns raised by residents, including wildlife and in particular, birds and bats. I do not doubt that a wide variety of birds may fly across the site from time to time and that bats inhabit the area. However there is no evidence that wildlife of any sort would be likely to be unacceptably harmed by the proposal or that monitoring conditions would not adequately protect their interests. This matter does attract significant weight against the scheme.

Whether the benefits outweigh the harm

73. In making the balanced judgement necessary, I do not underestimate the importance of achieving significantly higher levels of renewable energy generation to address climate change and meet national obligations. Wide environmental and economic benefits attach to all renewable energy proposals and are significant material considerations which have to be given very substantial weight. The Renewable Energy Roadmap of 2011 sets out actions that are intended to accelerate renewable energy, and there is no doubt that new onshore proposals will be needed to meet the 2020 obligation. However it is not the intention of Government that all renewable energy schemes should be supported, irrespective of any harm that might be caused.

74. I have taken into account the 2011 Budget in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer published proposals to help rebuild Britain's economy, including a 'Plan for Growth'. I give very significant weight to the need to support sustainable economic recovery. The Government has also completed consultation on the draft National Planning Policy Framework (dNPPF) which has been the subject of much comment. As a result it is likely that some changes will be made and at present it can only be given little weight. Nevertheless it builds on the Plan for Growth and advises that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Renewable energy projects are by definition sustainable. In respect of renewable energy projects, the dNPPF seeks to maximise renewable and low-carbon energy development while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily.

75. I turn now to consider the overall balance of the case. Having taken account of all the issues raised, the considerations which weigh in favour of the proposal are:

- (a) The important benefits of the production of renewable energy and assistance in meeting national obligations and aspirations;
- (b) The assistance in reducing the impact of climate change;

The matters which weigh against the proposal are:

- (a) The significant harm to landscape considerations and visual amenity;
- (b) The harm to the settings of heritage assets;
- (c) The harm to the living conditions of residential occupiers, in terms of outlook.

76. In this case, the harm that would occur to the attractive countryside in the Kym valley by reason of the location of turbines on the crest, in direct contravention of adopted supplementary guidance, is the most important factor and it is also the most serious contributing factor to the harm that would occur to the settings of heritage assets. In the light of adopted LP and CS policies and emerging DPD policies, it amounts to a very substantial objection. The harm to residential amenity also carries weight. Although permission would be for 25 years, after which the turbines would be removed, that is a very long time in which the sensitive character of this valley landscape would be seriously adversely affected, the enjoyment of the attractive valley landscape impaired and the settings of important heritage assets significantly harmed. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the environmental and economic benefits of the scheme would be significantly outweighed; and the appeal must be dismissed.

Paul Jackson

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Tina Douglass	Of Counsel
She called	
Chris Thompson MA(Cantab) MA (Landscape Design) CMLI	Landscape officer, Huntingdonshire District Council
Louise Brown BSc BArch MTP	Conservation Team Leader, Huntingdonshire District Council
Jennie Parsons BA (Hons) MRTPI PgDip UD	Development Management Team Leader, Huntingdonshire District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Marcus Trinick	Queens Counsel
He called	
Kenneth Halliday BSc M Phil CMLI	Director of Landscape Planning, Stephenson Halliday
Dr Stephen Carter BSc PhD MIFA FSAScot	Consultant, Headland Archaeology (UK) Ltd
David Bell BSc (Hons) Dip UD MRTPI MIHT	Director, Jones Lang LaSalle
Stephen Arnott BSc MIOA	Principal Associate Consultant, TNEI Services Ltd

FOR THE STOP BICTON WIND FARM GROUP (SBWF):

Peter Jennings	Of Counsel
He called	
Michelle Bolger BA(Eng) BA(Larch) Dip LA CMLI	Senior Associate, Liz Lake Associates
Nora Butler	Resident of Kimbolton
Jonathan Gray	Resident of Tilbrook
Nathan Hawkes	Resident of Kimbolton
John Lightfoot	Representing Kimbolton Cricket Club
Michael Monk	Chairman, Campaign to Protect Rural England, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Branch
Richard Murphy	Resident of Stow Longa
Charles Paull	Resident of Tilbrook
David Poole	Resident of Kimbolton

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Rosemary Lloyd	Chairman, Kimbolton and Stonely Parish Council
Michael Hayes	Chairman, Stow Longa Parish Council

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Letter of notification
- 2 Additional information relating to cricket, provided by SBWF
- 3 Clarification Note of Kenneth Halliday on amendments to Cultural Heritage Viewpoints E & F and Summary of Residential Visual Amenity Survey
- 4 Replacement Cultural Heritage Viewpoints E & F
- 5 Residential Visual Amenity Survey

- 6 Statement from Rosemary Lloyd
- 7 Comments on Figure 01 ZTV by Louise Brown dated 23 August 2011
- 8 Note on PPS5 Policy HE9, supplied by the appellant
- 9 Distillation of comments by English Heritage with respect to assets discussed as part of the evidence of Louise Brown, supplied by the Council
- 10 Elevation of existing 60m anemometer mast, provided by the appellant
- 11 Letter from English Heritage, dated 24 November 2011
- 12 Copies of correspondence relating to the location of noise measuring equipment (response to Inspector's request)
- 13 Bundle of responses to Inspector's request for the parties views on EH guidance 'The Setting of Heritage Assets' published in October 2011
- 14 Revised visualisations and methodology note from Envision Ltd, dated December 2011, together with appellant's table of current visualisations dated 20 December 2011
- 15 Comment on visualisation audit by Kenneth Halliday, dated 5 December 2011
- 16 'Commentary on various Cultural Heritage matters that post-date the Hearing of Evidence in August 2011' by Stephen Carter, dated 6 December 2011
- 17 Bundle of replies to Inspector's questions relating to amplitude modulation following submission of REF Information Note dated 31 October 2011 (including REF document and Inspector's questions)
- 18 Figures from DECC RE-stats Interactive Map at 19 December 2011, received from SBWF
- 19 Photograph of cedar tree in front of Kimbolton Castle, provided by the SBWF group
- 20 Copy of appeal decision ref APP/P2114/A/10/2125561, supplied by the SBWF group
- 21 Copy of email from Toby Lewis (Huntingdon Environmental Health) to Nathan Hawkes, dated 4 January 2011
- 22 Written statement from Robert Oliver, dated 4 December 2011 together with appellants' reply dated 17 January 2012
- 23 Background documentation to the adoption of HDC Wind Farm SPD, supplied by the Council
- 24 Visual aid for use with cricket wireframe (with no acknowledgement of accuracy) from the SBWF
- 25 Statement by David Bell and accompanying revised wireframe of Kimbolton Cricket Club
- 26 Briefing Note: Tilbury 750 MW Biomass Plant, provided by the appellant in response to Inspector's query

PLANS

- A1 Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment Map 1 'Landform'
- A2 Huntingdonshire Landscape and Townscape Assessment Map 1 'Landscape Character Areas'

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk