

Proposed amendments to Guidance Note 1: Wind Energy Development in Central Bedfordshire (March 2013)

Amendment made and where	Rationale for amendment
Introduction to renewables guidance and Guidance Note 1: Wind development in Central Bedfordshire split into two separate documents	Clarify the overall approach to be taken with all guidance notes looking at a range of technologies and to clarify that Wind isn't the only technology that will have guidance with regards to the approach to large scale Renewables in Central Bedfordshire.
Renewables Guidance introduction:	
1.7 Clarify what the Renewable guidance documents do and don't provide	To clarify the confusion that seemed to think the guidance notes were, site allocation documents, the council's climate change strategy etc and to provide more clarity on how they should be used.
Guidance note 1: Wind development in Central Bedfordshire	
1.4 – clarification as to review timescales and process for making changes	Acknowledges that technology, legislation, guidance is evolving alongside the understanding of how national planning policy impacts on these areas as it is tested through examinations and legal challenge.
1.6 – Change to from saying schemes have to 'meet criteria' to developers have to demonstrate how negative impacts will be mitigated.	To bring it in line with NPPF para 97 (bullet 2) and para 98 (bullet 2).
1.11 – clarify that some areas are not covered in detail e.g. Noise. Also highlights guidance produced by C.Beds CAS for RoW and Highways Agency.	This will reflect that guidance and understanding of impacts in evolving and gives flexibility for the latest approaches/evidence to be considered
1.12 – clarify other issues relating to public amenity e.g. highways etc are not covered but guidance is signposted too in the references section.	Clarify other useful guidance from bodies that would be consulted on planning apps
2.3 - Remove reference to large wind farms as being 11 or more turbines	There is no clear definition as to what constitutes a medium or large wind farm and impact is variable depending on size of turbines e.g. 11 60m turbines may have less impact than 11 150m turbines.
2.10 – Key principles for assessing planning applications for energy developments in the NPPF, EN-1 and EN-3 reiterated.	Attempt to make it clearer that ultimately if a proposal can be made acceptable to the Council it would have to be approved and that local landscape designations in their own right cannot be solely be used to refuse planning applications.

Amendment made and where	Rationale for amendment
2.13 - Clarified why Scottish Heritage guidance is referred too	Highlight that this is used in the absence of English guidance and is used by many other LA in England. That obviously differences in landscape type are taken into consideration when applying this.
3.3 – Text added to acknowledge other constraints faced by wind developers for finding suitable sites.	Highlight that there are many other factors that determine site selection above and beyond wind speed.
4.11 – text added to highlight the difference status of AONB and Community forest landscape designations.	Clarify that they are viewed differently by law and the designations have different purposes.
4.12 - Amend text to clarify status of different designations	Answer the criticism that we are giving non-designated areas the same level of status as AONB, but also clarifying that even non-designated landscapes are valued locally and should still be considered
5.10 - Include reference to site assessments carried out to 'ground proof' assessment made and also reference to possible need for future 'fine grain' studies of areas	To demonstrate that the assessment made has been backed up by site visits etc and has not just been done on GIS and to also give scope to look in more detail at areas likely to face a greater impact.
6.7 - Paragraph removed	Emotive and difficult to substantiate
7.0 – Methodology clarified	To provide further clarity on approach taken to carry out assessment.
7.10 - Landscape character text and map moved	Name changed to landscape assets and moved to prior to section on other considerations (Heritage and wildlife) and sites mapped directly relate to these. Additional text added to clarify impact of NPPF – that these aren't no go zones but a far greater level of mitigation is needed to limit impact.
Map 4 - (Renumbered to Map 3). AONB shown separately, minor changes to some areas as a result of ground proofing. Changes to colour coding of areas to clarify different sensitivities.	To clarify that we aren't classing highly sensitive landscapes as being at the same level as the AONB. A lot of incorrect conclusions were made in consultation responses from maps so changing colour coding should clarify these.
Map 7 – LUC Visual Sensitivity map move to appendices to be replaced will map showing areas of search	LUC map misinterpreted in consultation. Areas of search map will point wind developments to areas of low sensitivity as per brief.
8.7 – Amendment to table 2 based on ground proofing observations.	
10.0 – minor clarifications to advice given on heritage, and biodiversity. Heritage and Archaeology text merged.	To clarify some points and remove repetition. Also highlight that in every instance a case by case assessment is needed and will be based on these principles.
13.0 - Other issues. Changes to Noise text based on Env Health. Better overview given with regard to ETSU-R-97 and how it would be used given its age. New text from Environmental Health. Text added regarding	To allow flexibility with regards to how noise and other associated impacts are considered and to take into account changes in technology, turbine size etc since ETSU-R-97 was originally published 15 years ago.

Amendment made and where	Rationale for amendment
reversibility of wind farm developments.	Reversibility text added to clarify that limited lifespan of 25 years ins not considered temporary.
14.0 References - Additional guidance documents added	Sign post other guidance and considerations etc