
CHAPTER 12: INSET PLANS

12.1 Overview

12.1.1 In this section of the report I examine objections to the Inset Plans prepared in respect of Barford, Bishops Tachbrook, Lapworth/Kingswood, and Coventry Airport, Siskin Drive. I recommend that the village envelope for Lapworth/Kingswood be modified to include an additional area of land with a road frontage at Kingswood Nurseries.

12.2 Barford

Objections to First Deposit Version

- 12/AA Mr & Mrs K Hope
- 52/AH Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council
- 115/AC Alan Roberts
- 289/AA Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd¹
- 292/AA Oldhams Transport Ltd²
- 293/AA Oldhams Transport Ltd³

Objections to Revised Deposit Version

No objections

Key Issues

- 12.2.1** (1) Whether the village envelope is appropriately defined in relation to Little Watchbury, High Street, Barford.
- (2) Whether the village envelope is appropriately drawn at ‘The Villas’, Hareway Lane; Barford Lodge, Church Lane; and land at the rear of Mill Lane.
- (3) Whether the village envelope should include the area alongside Sherbourne Nursery.
- (4) Whether land at Oldham’s Transport should be included in the village envelope.

Inspector’s Appraisal and Conclusions

12.2.2 Issue 1: The village envelope was amended in the First Deposit version of the Plan from that shown in the adopted Local Plan. In response to an objection, the boundary

¹ This objection is addressed jointly with related objections (Chapter 10, Section 10.11, Issue 1)

² This objection is addressed jointly with related objections (Chapter 10, Section 10.11, Issue 1)

³ This objection is addressed jointly with related objections (Chapter 10, Section 10.11, Issue 1)

was changed back to the original location in the Revised Deposit Plan. The village envelope now once again includes the whole of the garden of that property. The objectors have confirmed that their objection is conditionally withdrawn. I endorse that alteration.

12.2.3 Issue 2: The boundary changes proposed in respect of land at the rear of Mill Lane were not carried forward into the Revised Deposit Plan. Instead, the boundaries reverted to those in the adopted Local Plan. However, the changes made at ‘The Villas’ and ‘Barford Lodge’ were carried through into the Revised Deposit Plan. I agree that, being located beyond the edge of the village proper, those properties ought not to be included within the settlement boundary. I support the District Council’s proposals and note that Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton Joint Parish Council has subsequently withdrawn its objection.

12.2.4 Issue 3: Again, this objection has been met by the boundary reverting in the Revised Deposit Plan to that indicated in the adopted Local Plan. I endorse that alteration.

12.2.5 Issue 4: The village envelope was amended in the Revised Deposit Plan to include land in the ownership of Oldham’s Transport within the line of the Barford by-pass, now under construction. It does not include all of the land identified by the objectors in their original objection but it does equate with that put forward in their proof of evidence proposing that the site be allocated for a mixed use development. I support the boundary suggested by the District Council for several reasons. First of all, the Secretary of State has indicated that she is minded to grant planning permission for a mixed use development on this site making it more likely that development will proceed along the lines suggested by the objector. Secondly, I agree that the line of the by-pass represents a clear, defensible boundary. And thirdly, there is no logic in extending the boundary further to the west. There is no existing development beyond the by-pass. Any development which is encouraged there would set a precedent making it more difficult to resist other encroachments into the surrounding countryside. I note that land was compulsorily purchased by the County Council for the by-pass. However, the District Council says it has no knowledge of whether other land west of the by-pass is still in the ownership of Oldhams Transport Ltd.

Recommendations

12.2.6 That no modifications be made to the Revised Deposit Plan in respect of these objections.

12.3 Bishops Tachbrook

Objections to First Deposit Version

No objections

Objections to Revised Deposit Version

342/RAA	Pamela Smith
346/RAA	J M Glenn
346/RAB	J M Glenn
346/RAC	J M Glenn
123/AA	Robin Hedger

Key Issues

- 12.3.1** (1) Whether, in respect of Savages Close, the village envelope should remain unchanged from the adopted Local Plan.
- (2) Whether Bishops Tachbrook should be classified as a Limited Growth Village. If so, whether the village envelope should be expanded to accommodate housing development on adjacent land where no previously-developed sites are available.
- (3) Whether (a) fields east of the Leopard Inn should be allocated for a mix of market and affordable housing, and/or (b) land west of the Leopard Inn should be allocated for affordable housing, and both sites included in the village envelope; and (c) (subject to a reasonable market price being achieved for the sale of (a) and/or (b) above), a further site to the west should be used for open space/recreational purposes and gifted to the Parish Council.

Inspector's Appraisal and Conclusions

12.3.2 Issue 1: (*Savages Close, Bishops Tachbrook*) The objector considers that the village envelope for Bishops Tachbrook should not be changed. It has stood the test of time. Infilling has occurred in the past within Savages Close and on land forming part of the Manor House Estate. This has taken place in accordance with the non-statutory 1987 Village Policy Statement and the subsequent adopted Local Plan and has presented no planning difficulties. There is no evidence to suggest that it is a 'loose' boundary. While the District Council says that it is necessary to redefine the village boundary to reflect current national and strategic policy, the objector considers that it only requires a different policy emphasis to be applied to development. Any future proposals to develop greenfield land within the village envelope would then have to accord with the adopted policy context, relying upon a community appraisal to identify need and the availability or otherwise of previously developed land.

12.3.3 The objector points out that the village envelope proposed in the Revised Deposit Plan does not enclose all of the built-up area of the village. It excludes a group of 17 dwellings to the east of Oakley Wood Road around Savages Close, while a much smaller collection of dwellings to the south of this area has been left within the boundary. It is argued that Savages Close and the Manor House are an integral part of the historic core of the village and contribute significantly to the conservation area. Their exclusion and treatment as open countryside would not only preclude infilling but also redevelopment, replacement or subdivision of existing properties which could usefully increase density or provide smaller dwellings to meet local need and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The objector considers that the currently adopted village boundary is the appropriate one to endure over the longer term and to accommodate any further shifts in policy context without the need for continual amendment or closing down future options.

- 12.3.4** I agree with the District Council that the Limited Infill Village boundaries in the 1995 adopted Local Plan are no longer appropriate. They reflect outdated national, regional and Structure Plan policies. At that time less emphasis was placed on the use of brownfield land and sustainable development, and rather more on environmental considerations. In contrast, current national planning policy guidance concentrates most new development into the urban areas, gives greater priority to previously developed land, and calls for restraint on housing in rural areas.
- 12.3.5** The level of housing development in the rural areas of the District has far exceeded that allowed for in the Structure Plan. The Structure Plan anticipated 420 dwellings between 1996 and 2011. At April 2005 a total of 1,113 dwellings had been provided and a further 176 were under construction. As a result, the policies of the Revised Deposit Local Plan are more restrictive than those of the adopted Local Plan. Rural housing is limited to local needs only on previously developed land in the 5 Limited Growth Villages identified in Policy RAP2 which have a basic level of services and facilities. They include Bishops Tachbrook.
- 12.3.6** The Limited Growth Village boundary for Bishops Tachbrook has been amended to reflect this more restrictive policy. The village envelope now includes a small cul-de-sac to the west of the settlement at Seven Acre Close. But it excludes 2 small open areas (the Leopard Inn car park, and part of the primary school playing field) so that the boundary runs tightly around the built-up parts of the village. Also excluded is a larger area at Savages Close which has a more open appearance and which is separated from the rest of the settlement by the B4087 Oakley Wood Road and a landscaped buffer. I agree with the District Council that the character of this land is rather different from the rest of the village. Containing greenfield land, it would not appear to be suitable for further development. I note that at the time of the hearing into this objection there was a planning application outstanding for a detached house in that general locality. In contrast, the group of dwellings on the east side of Oakley Wood Road but further to the south, accessed directly from the B4087, has a greater affinity with the built-up area of the settlement than the surrounding countryside. I see no harm in the village envelope bisecting the conservation area. They are different planning instruments serving dissimilar purposes.
- 12.3.7** I conclude that the village envelope for Bishops Tachbrook should be drawn as per the Revised Deposit Plan and that, in particular, land at Savages Close should not be included within that boundary.
- 12.3.8 Issue 2:** Bishops Tachbrook has a basic range of services and facilities. It satisfies the criteria set out in Paragraph 8.14 of the Plan. In those circumstances, I am content with its inclusion as one of the five Limited Growth Villages identified in Policy RAP2. Reflecting policy changes at national and strategic levels, the village envelope has been drawn more tightly than in the current adopted Local Plan in order to restrict development in the rural area and to concentrate it on previously developed land. Open areas adjacent to the former boundary are now excluded from the village envelope. They comprise part of the Leopard Inn car park, part of the primary school playing field, and the area around Savages Close. I consider that to be appropriate. While there may be little brownfield land available at present it is possible that sites could come forward during the currency of the Plan leading to modest growth.
- 12.3.9** One of the objectors would like Policy RAP2 to be reworded along the following lines: "...a) it is for affordable housing on previously developed land within the Limited

Growth Villages of Barford, Bishops Tachbrook, Hampton Magna, Lapworth (Kingswood) and Radford Semele as defined on the Proposals Map and, where no such previously developed land is available, on other suitable land adjacent to the village envelope, which would then be included in the village envelope for this purpose". In promoting this objection, reference is made to the lack of previously developed land within Bishops Tachbrook, the Council's target of securing just 100 new affordable homes per year when some 6,000 affordable homes are required to satisfy District needs between now and 2011, and the compact nature of the village whose population relies heavily on commuting for work to nearby Leamington Spa and other employment locations.

12.3.10 I do not believe it is necessary or desirable to amend the Policy in the manner suggested. The need for affordable housing throughout much of the District and objective 1C of the Plan's Core Strategy, must be balanced with other considerations. Such amendment would serve to make the Policy more restrictive in other ways. Criterion a) of the Revised Deposit version of Policy RAP2 allows for market housing on previously developed land within the Limited Growth Villages where it would meet a specific local need identified by the community in an appraisal or assessment. That would be precluded by the objector's proposals. In any event, I note that Bishops Tachbrook comprises for the main part small terraced or semi-detached houses making it more affordable than many other settlements in the District.

12.3.11 Issue 3: (*Land adjacent to the Leopard Inn, Bishops Tachbrook*) Taking each of the site-specific matters in turn. Site A comprises 2 fields totalling 2.4ha on the eastern side of Oakley Wood Road to the north of Savages Close. The northern part of the site adjacent to Tach Brook is subject to occasional flooding and would be unsuitable for residential development. It would be left as a wildlife area. The land would be accessed directly from the B4087. Reflecting the Parish Council's concern that the village needs larger family style homes to balance the preponderance of smaller dwellings, the objector envisages that the site would be developed with a mix of larger market housing as well as affordable homes, and added to the village envelope.

12.3.12 I do not consider such development would be appropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly, the site is highly prominent at the northern entrance to the village. This is clearly demonstrated in Photograph 1 supplied by the District Council and appended to its further written statement. It would erode the gap separating Bishops Tachbrook from Whitnash, setting a precedent for development in this sensitive location that could over the course of time lead to the settlements merging. Secondly, it would not accord with the thrust of emerging Local Plan policy. In compliance with national and strategic guidance, that framework seeks to concentrate most new development into the urban areas of the District and onto previously developed land. There would be direct conflict with the terms of Policy RAP2 which, in allowing limited growth to meet local needs in villages like Bishops Tachbrook has drawn the village envelope boundaries tightly around the existing built-up area. Thirdly, as regards the market housing element of the proposals, the District has already exceeded its strategic housing target. There is clear evidence of an oversupply of housing. This led the planning authority in 2005 to introduce a Supplementary Planning Document 'Managing Housing Supply' to reduce the future supply of urban windfall sites. And in terms of housing needs beyond 2011, the housing requirements of the District are uncertain pending completion of the partial review of the RSS. Current indications are that urban brownfield sites will be able to satisfy the bulk of additional housing needed beyond 2011. Any greenfield releases should be done through preparation of a DPD where a comparative analysis can be

undertaken in the context of a sustainability appraisal and public consultation. And fourthly, the site does not adjoin the village envelope to the south. In the Revised Deposit Plan, land at Savages Close is excluded. In my report I have already endorsed that alteration from the adopted Plan. Consequently, Site A would not relate well to the village envelope but would be out on a limb.

12.3.13 Turning to Site B, this 1.8ha rectangular site lying to the west of the Leopard Inn and north of Croft Close is promoted as an affordable housing site. The land is accessed via a driveway leading between domestic garages. It extends as far north as the Tach Brook and is enclosed by mature hedging. It was formerly part of Church Farm, and subsequently Wyslade Farm. Owing to its size and location it has not been used for agricultural purposes for more than a decade. The topography and screening is such that development in this location would be out of sight of much of the village, although it would be seen from Croft Close to the south and from Brookside Farm and the bungalow immediately to the north of the Tach Brook. Approximately half of the site is owned by the objector's family who still have local connections. Located less than 5km from Leamington Spa it is argued that it could provide affordable housing for key public sector workers and for people employed at Trident Business Park, Gallagher Business Park, Spa Business Park and Warwick Technology Park. The objector says that his family is willing to enter into discussions with the District Council to sell the land at a discounted rate (as has been done, for example, by Herefordshire Council) to enable affordable housing to be provided.

12.3.14 I see no reason to allocate this land for affordable housing or to include it in the village envelope. Like Site A, it would extend the compact form of the settlement boundary northwards in a linear fashion, eating away at the relatively narrow gap that maintains the separate identities and integrity of Bishops Tachbrook and Whitnash. While there is an undeniable need for many more affordable homes throughout the District (and some of this in the rural areas), I believe this should be addressed through the use of previously developed land within the settlement boundaries of the Limited Growth Villages, rather than by taking greenfield sites into the village envelope and then allocating them for low cost housing. Alternatively, if no brownfield land is available then the 'rural exception' provisions of Policy RAP5 should be applied. But, as the District Council says, a strong and convincing case would need to be made before such land could be released. I note that the precise needs of Bishops Tachbrook have not been identified through a parish or village appraisal. The consultation draft of PPS3 indicates that: "Local planning authorities should consider, in applying the rural exception policy, the need to meet the needs of the rural economy, and in particular the needs of households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection, in order that the rural communities remain sustainable, mixed, inclusive and cohesive." The essence of national policy is that rural housing should meet rural needs, not general needs arising from the urban area no matter how close. I do not accept therefore that key public sector workers in Leamington Spa and on the District's business parks need to live in Bishops Tachbrook. In any event, it is likely that no more than a small minority of those workers would be assisted by affordable housing. As the District Council points out, the majority of affordable housing is occupied as social rented housing by those with very low levels of affordability.

12.3.15 Site C comprises a very long but fairly narrow strip of flat land running along the rear of houses and garages on the northern side of Bishops Tachbrook. I saw on my site visit that adjoining parcels of land to the south have previously been sold to some householders in order to extend their gardens. The objector's family is prepared to offer

this site (or parts of it) at no cost to the Parish Council for use as amenity land under Policy SC11 - providing sufficient development is allowed on Sites A and/or B to make it worthwhile. It is suggested that the land should then be incorporated into the village envelope. Once again, I do not support this suggestion. While no doubt of some benefit to the community in terms of improved public access to recreation space and the surrounding countryside, it could only be achieved at a high cost of accepting residential development that under most circumstances would not be acceptable under the Plan's policy regime.

12.3.16 I note that Sites A and B were included in the Omission Sites Consultation exercise. This resulted in 5 objections to Site A with no supporting representations, and 7 objections in respect of Site B with, again, no letters of support. Those objections are indicative of public feeling. They reinforce my overall conclusions that neither of these potential housing sites, nor Site C, should be allocated for development and/or be included in the village envelope for Bishops Tachbrook. I also consider it would be inappropriate to include other areas on the margins of the settlement but outside the defined policy boundary, including the existing playing fields on the south-east side of the village.

Recommendations

12.3.17 That no modifications be made to the Revised Deposit Plan in respect of these objections.

12.4 Lapworth/Kingswood

Objections to First Deposit Version

5/AC	Mrs Christa Knight-Adams
35/AA	Verguti Franco
56/AA	Kathleen Chambers
63/AA	Patricia Harrison
83/AA	Hugh Stephen Williams
97/AA	Sheila M Light
100/AA	J.B Hale
112/AA	Jeffery Masters
118/AE	Mr and Mrs G Bull
119/AE	Bloor Homes Ltd
133/AA	Norma Cole
170/AA	Mr Martin Wood
206/AA	Graham Hames

Objections to Revised Deposit Version

No objections

Key Issues

- 12.4.1** (1) Whether land adjacent to Clover Hill should be included within the Lapworth/Kingswood village envelope.
- (2) Whether land off Brome Hall Lane should be incorporated into the Lapworth/Kingswood village envelope.
- (3) Whether Kingswood Nurseries should be included within the village envelope.
- (4) Whether Kingswood Farm and adjoining land to the east (as far as the canal) should be incorporated into the village envelope.

Inspector's Appraisal and Conclusions

12.4.2 Issue 1: This issue has been addressed elsewhere in my report in response to a related objection (see Chapter 8, Policy RAP2, Issue 26). My conclusion is that the land should not be incorporated into the Lapworth/Kingswood village envelope.

12.4.3 Issue 2: The site adjacent to Clover Hill forms part of a larger tract of land accessed off Brome Hall Lane (see Chapter 8, Policy RAP2, Issue 27). I conclude that this more extensive area of predominantly greenfield land in the Green Belt and on the edge of the settlement should not be included within the Lapworth/Kingswood village envelope.

12.4.4 Issue 3: Again, this issue has been considered in another section of my report when dealing with related objections to the allocation of Kingswood Nurseries for housing (see Chapter 10, Policy omissions, Issue 5). My conclusion is that the village envelope should be enlarged to include the frontage land, in recognition of planning permission granted on appeal for the construction of 4 terraced cottages but that the remainder of the land should be excluded from the settlement boundary. For convenience, that recommendation is repeated below.

12.4.5 Issue 4: This matter has been substantially addressed in examining proposals to include Kingswood Nurseries within the village envelope and allocate that adjoining site for housing (see Chapter 10, Policy omissions, Issue 5). The background is similar in that Kingswood Farmhouse was included within the village envelope in the adopted Local Plan but excluded from the First and Revised Deposit versions of the emerging Plan. In brief, I consider that because this farmhouse stands on a large plot on the margins of the village it has more in common with the character of the surrounding rural area than with the built-up area of the settlement. An even stronger argument applies in respect of the completely undeveloped land to the east reaching to the Grand Union Canal.

Recommendations

12.4.6 (a) That the Revised Deposit Plan be modified as follows:

amend the Village Envelope on the Lapworth Kingswood Inset to include an additional area of land at Kingswood Nurseries, as shown on the plan at Appendix 2b of the District Council's further written statement (Ref: WDC/FWS/112/AB, 118/AF and 119/AF (Kingswood Nurseries)/1) July 2006.

- (b) **That no further modifications be made to the Revised Deposit Plan in respect of these objections.**

12.5 Coventry Airport Siskin Drive

Objections to First Deposit Version

No objections

Objections to Revised Deposit Version

1/RAB	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust
10/RAB	Bubbenhall Parish Council
64/RAB	Leek Wootton & Guys Cliffe Parish Council
307/RAB	Deborah Germaine
308/RAB	Andy Patrick
311/RAB	Sally Begg
314/RAB	Sandra French
318/RAB	Alan Begg
320/RAB	Stuart Jordan
325/RAB	Rod Wheat
326/RAB	Gillian Wheat
328/RAB	John Ciriani
333/RAA	Benita and William Parry
336/RAB	Anthony Francis
338/RAA	Diane Francis
340/RAB	Steve Williams

Key Issues

- 12.5.1** (1) Whether the Coventry Airport (Policy SSP7) boundary should revert to that which existed before 30 April 2004 when passenger flights commenced.
- (2) Whether the policy position of the Airport outside the red line on the Inset Plan requires clarification.
- (3) Whether the Airport boundary should include land not previously within the operational boundary.
- (4) Whether revisions to the Local Plan are aimed at facilitating growth in air passenger traffic.

Inspector's Appraisal and Conclusions

- 12.5.2 Issue 1:** The SSP7 policy area shown on the Inset Plan covers the existing South apron and buildings associated with it that were erected under 'permitted development' rights (other than the IPF) and remaining areas of land immediately adjacent that were undeveloped at the time of the boundary definition. It was drawn to restrict development

at the Airport to a limited area of land outside the Green Belt. I agree with the District Council that reducing the area to that where activity took place prior to the onset of passenger operations from the IPF would be likely to prevent the development of facilities necessary for the reasonable growth of the Airport. It would therefore conflict with national and regional policy.

12.5.3 Issue 2: Beyond the Policy SSP7 area defined by a red line and shading on the Inset Plan, the remainder of the Airport lies within the Green Belt. This is explained in Paragraph 10.42A of the supporting text. Green Belt policy is set out in Policy DAP1. Within the Green Belt very special circumstances have to be demonstrated to justify inappropriate development. In my view, the policy position is quite clear and requires no clarification.

12.5.4 Issue 3: I have previously considered similar objections raised elsewhere (see Chapter 10, Policy SSP7, Issue 1). In brief, operational land and the area where Policy SSP7 applies are separate matters. Land regarded as 'operational' benefits from 'permitted development' rights granted by Part 18 of the GPDO. The site defined by Policy SSP7 is that area where it may be possible to undertake development requiring planning permission, provided that the various policy criteria are met. It is irrelevant whether or not it is operational land for the purposes of the GPDO. In my opinion, the boundary where Policy SSP7 applies has been drawn correctly. It allows for limited development in the most appropriate location on the south-east side of the runway away from residential properties in Baginton and outside the Green Belt.

12.5.5 Issue 4: I am satisfied that the alterations made to the Plan at Revised Deposit stage and subsequently have been undertaken to reflect the changes in national and regional policy arising from publication of the ATWP and the RSS, and subsequent clarification. Policy SSP7 is a criteria-based policy which does not actively encourage growth in passenger traffic but remains broadly neutral, providing a set of criteria against which to assess specific proposals.

Recommendations

12.5.6 That no modifications be made to the Revised Deposit Plan in respect of these objections.

12.6 Airport Safeguarding Composite

Objection to First Deposit Version

148/BZ Campaign to Protect Rural England (Warwickshire Branch)

Objections to Revised Deposit Version

199/RAD James Mackay

321/RAZ West Midlands International Airport Ltd

Key Issues

- 12.6.1** (1) Whether the airport safeguarding composite map should be amended to accord with the safeguarding map used by Coventry Airport.
- (2) Whether the Plan should indicate that windfarm development is inappropriate anywhere in the District.
- (3) Whether the area within which windfarms are restricted should be kept to a minimum.

Inspector's Appraisal and Conclusions

12.6.2 Issue 1: Coventry Airport contend that the airport safeguarding composite map included in the Revised Deposit Plan is incorrect in that the area shaded red requiring consultation on all buildings etc exceeding 10m in height should be repositioned to the south-west of Stoneleigh. The procedure for notifying the District Council about relevant consultation areas is set out in the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, as subsequently amended. Under this procedure the Safeguarding Committee at Coventry Airport, acting on behalf of the Civil Aviation Authority, formally notifies the District Council when changes need to be made to the consultation areas. The last such notification was made in February 2003. I am assured that the map included in the emerging Local Plan reflects those alterations. Since then, the Safeguarding Committee has not formally required the District Council to amend the consultation areas. In any event, the plan accompanying the objection is not sufficiently detailed or accurate to be used as the basis for such changes. I agree with the planning authority that the most appropriate course of action is for the objector to liaise with the Safeguarding Committee and, if necessary, formally notify the District Council of any changes required. I note that the District Council is willing to substitute a revised map prior to adoption of the Local Plan in order to reflect the latest and most up-to-date information available. In the meantime, I see no grounds for modifying the airport safeguarding composite map.

12.6.3 Issue 2: The airport safeguarding composite map shows the areas where consultation with the relevant aerodrome (Coventry Airport) or technical site operator (Honiley Beacon Technical Site) is required in respect of certain types of development proposals, in accordance with Circular 01/2003⁴. But it does not identify which types of development might be inappropriate. It does not therefore preclude wind farms or any other specific types of development.

12.6.4 Issue 3: The objector argues that the airport safeguarding composite map effectively prevents windfarm development on all higher ground to the north-west of the main urban areas by giving priority to aircraft flights that are carbon-intensive over renewable energy schemes essential to achievement of Government policy objectives. The general comments made in respect of Issue 2 above are relevant to this objection. National planning policy, set out in PPS22 (Renewable Energy), is 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.” The advice goes on to indicate that “regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote

⁴ Circular 01/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: The Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002.

and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources.” Policy DP12a of the Revised Deposit Plan addresses renewable energy developments in a local context, endeavouring to balance competing interests. Amongst other matters, the policy criteria seek to ensure there is no unacceptable impact on public safety. I am satisfied that the airport safeguarding composite map does not impose unnecessary restrictions and that the area within which windfarm development might prove unacceptable on safety grounds is kept to a minimum. Consequently, I consider that to some extent this objection has been met.

Recommendations

12.6.5 That no modifications be made to the Revised Deposit Plan in respect of these objections.
