

ST KEW PARISH COUNCIL



Chairman: Cllr Richard Godden

Clerk: Cindy Powell, 6 Greenhill Villas, Wadebridge PL27 6HN

Tel: 01208 815591 Email: clerk@stkewparish.org.uk

www.stkewparish.org.uk

Minutes of St Kew Parish Council Planning Meeting held on Monday 17th June 2013 at 06:00 pm at Tregellist Farm

Present: Chairman: T Mott, Cllrs Parnell, E Hambly, J Lethbridge, J Rowe, R Godden, A Godden, J Rickard, and R Hawken

County Councillor A Penny and 49 members of the public were in attendance

602.

Planning application PA13/04170 – Mr M Cleave, Tregellist Farm PL30 3HG Installation of 1 no. micro scale turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)

The Chairman opened the meeting and thanked all for attending. He said that the meeting would commence with a presentation from the applicants Site Agent, followed by comments from Parish Councillors. The meeting would then be adjourned for public discussion before reconvening for a Council vote.

The applicant Mr Cleave said that his closest neighbour supported his application but he would hand over to his agent for full details. The company Windcrop is the largest installer of small wind turbines and electricity supplied is for personal use and not destined for the national grid. It generated 5 kw of electricity. The turbine is not set in concrete so causes minimal ground damage. He said that a height of 45 metres should not be intrusive and strict guidelines were to be followed for the siting.

Cllr Rickard said that he did not understand the noise data statistics and asked how noisy the turbine would be for his neighbour. He was advised that with a 5.5m per second wind speed it should be less than 40 decibels at 100m, although the data was compiled for large turbines.

Cllr Hambly asked by whose classification this turbine was defined as micro, and was told that this was a Cornwall Council classification. She mentioned that it appeared to be sited closer to the neighbour than the applicant, and asked if we were standing in the correct position for the turbine. She also queried the noise data, saying that if the correct figures were not submitted then the application would be refused.

The meeting was then adjourned for the public to comment and question.

The Site Agent was asked the cost of the turbine and said that it was either supplied free to the applicant who used all electricity generated and Windcrop covered it's costs and made profits from the feeding tariff. Or it could be purchased for £20,000 and the owner recovered the feeding tariff.

Questions were asked regarding wildlife, especially swallows, and were told that there was strict guidelines for siting turbines well away from hedges so should not affect birds and bats.

Another neighbour mentioned the prevailing wind and said that should carry any noise away from nearby properties.

There were objections as the property was on the edge of an AONB and visible for many miles around, and were told that as this was a small turbine this should not be so visible.

The Chairman then asked for a show of hands so that public response could be considered. 37 were supported the applicant and 12 were against.
The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr R Godden said that he had door knocked in Tregellist to gauge reaction and found 7 for the proposal, 3 against and 2 were not in.

Cllr Parnell said that the Planning website had 12 for and 6 against.

Cllr Hawken said that he thought that the noise issue was less than expected.

Cllr Hambly said that although this was a small turbine, as it was so close to the neighbours it would appear almost as big as the large scale turbines recently erected.

It was proposed by Cllr R Godden and seconded by Cllr Hawken that the Parish Council recommend **APPROVAL** provided it passes the noise data.

It was proposed by Cllr Hambly and seconded by Cllr Parnell that the Parish Council recommend **REFUSAL** as the turbine was visually overbearing and exceeds noise limits.

The second proposal was voted on and two Councillors were in favour and 6 against. The motion for refusal was therefore not carried.

The first proposal was voted on and 6 Councillors recommended **APPROVAL** with two against, therefore this was carried.

The meeting ended at 18:50 hrs