
Site Address:	41 Frances Road, Purbrook, Waterlooville, PO7 5HH		
Proposal:	Retention of 5.2m vertical axis wind turbine attached to rear outbuilding.		
Application No:	APP/13/00870	Expiry Date:	29/10/2013
Applicant:	Mr P Vine	Team:	Team 1
Agent:	Mr R Day	Case Officer:	Richard Nash
Ward:	Purbrook		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

The application site is located on the north side of Frances Road, to the west of its junction with Fir Copse Road. The site contains a semi-detached single storey dwelling of traditional design and finish on a reasonably sized rectangular plot. The area is predominantly characterised by residential properties of a broadly similar design and density. Conjoined outbuildings constructed of various materials are located at the rear (north) end of the site, where a public footpath runs along the boundary. In this part of the application site each side boundary contains mature evergreen trees, with others being located adjacent to the outbuildings.

Although the site is generally flat, the ground level falls to the rear, so that the public footpath is approximately 1.2 metres lower than the application site. To the north of the footpath are the rear gardens of properties in Alameda Road, where the ground level again drops rapidly, so that these gardens are approximately 2.7 metres lower than the footpath.

2 Planning History

APP/12/00701

Retention of 5.2m vertical axis wind turbine attached to rear outbuilding. Approved for Temporary Period.

3 Proposal

The current application seeks the retention of the 5.2m vertical axis wind turbine attached to the rear outbuilding (granted temporary planning permission reference APP/12/00701) on a permanent basis.

4 Policy Considerations

National Policies

National Planning Policy Framework

Core Strategies 2011 forming part of the HBLDF

CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
DM10	(Pollution)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Environmental Health Manager:

Has reviewed the application documents and those associated with the previous application, resulting in the temporary consent that the applicant is now seeking to extend. Note that numerous objections were [previously] received from local residents, including concerns regarding both noise and light. Also note that in the absence of noise data, EHO had lodged an objection to the previous retrospective application. Applicant has not included any noise information with this application, which it was indicated in the informative to APP/12/00701 consent would be required for any future application to extend temporary consent or obtain permanent consent. EHO has however checked complaints records and note that despite the level of objection to the initial application has not received a single complaint relating to either reflections/light or noise. Would interpret this to mean that the conditioned finish (matt green paint) is effective in preventing reflections from causing a nuisance to neighbours, and the assertion that the design is inherently quieter than the horizontal axis 'prop' type turbines is correct.

Visual impact considerations notwithstanding, in the context of the above there is no justifiable reason to object to application to extend consent for a turbine that is clearly not causing noise or light pollution to neighbouring residential property. Would however recommend condition relating to finish is retained, as imposed previously (and as reproduced below with minor amendment):

The development shall be entirely maintained in a non-reflective green finish to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the appearance and character of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 9

Number of site notices: 0

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 2

Summary:

1: Observations of wind turbine through the year lead to conclusion the experiment has not been hugely successful. Turbine ceased turning on 22 May 2013 and apart from occasional flurry, appears to have been non-functional since that date. Electric power generation records would prove this one way or another. Recently, the occasional turning of the turbine was accompanied by a fairly loud 'clicking' noise which coincided with the speed of the turbine turning. Last week or so it was clear that

the mechanism was not working properly as it is now wired up to stop it from turning. Leads to the conclusion that the machine is not providing the perceived benefit to the householder and should not be granted permission to remain in place.

2: Turbine is an eyesore which is not in working order and is wired up and left to rust away. When it was working the only access for maintenance was by standing on the garage roof which is about 40 foot above neighbouring garden and gives direct line of sight into rear of house - at times meant neighbour could not sunbathe or even sit comfortably in own back garden. Before it was wired up the noise from the structure was incessant and would go on day and night with a whooping type of sound. With the turbine movement and the noise from it so disturbed dogs that they would constantly bark and then cause others in the neighbourhood to join in. Future prospective sale would be severely hampered by what can only be described as a horrible eyesore that no one would want at the end of their garden.

Comment: Impact on house values and the efficiency of the turbine are not material planning considerations. The impact of the development on neighbouring amenities is discussed below.

7 Planning Considerations

Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact on application site
- (iii) Impact on neighbouring amenities
- (iv) Impact on public domain

(i) Principle of development

The NPPF and Core Strategy are strongly supportive of renewable or low carbon energy proposals and it is considered that the provision of a relatively small wind turbine within the curtilage of a residential dwelling is acceptable in principle.

(ii) Impact on application site

The turbine and supporting structure are of a self-build nature, constructed entirely of aluminium and painted in matt green. The turbine is located to the rear of the dwelling, close to the northern end of the curtilage, adjoining outbuildings and trees. The design of the proposal is of a somewhat functional nature. However, this would not be unexpected with such devices and, on balance, it is considered the development does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the application site.

(iii) Impact on neighbouring amenities

Taken by itself the development has a quite stark appearance when viewed from adjoining properties, particularly those in Alameda Road, where changes in ground levels mean the highest part of the turbine is approximately 8 metres above the garden areas. However, the supporting structure is largely screened by the existing outbuildings in views from this direction, whilst mature trees provide a backdrop to the development from most angles.

Any views from this direction where the turbine breaks the skyline would be at oblique

angles and within a relatively small area. Views of the development from the properties to the east and west of the site would be similarly backdropped or screened by existing trees. The painting of the turbine has further reduced its visual impact and the retention of an appropriate finish could be controlled by way of a planning condition.

The bulk of the structure is relatively limited and resultant overshadowing to adjoining properties would be within the context of that formed by the existing trees and outbuildings. Concern has been expressed over the potential for overlooking adjoining properties during maintenance of the turbine. However, this would only arise on an occasional basis and could not be considered abnormal in a relatively densely developed residential area.

It was previously considered appropriate to allow a temporary consent for the turbine in order to be able to assess its impact in terms of noise and light reflection. The latter has not been raised as a concern in response to the current application, and the retention of an appropriate finish should again assist with this issue. Noise has however been raised as a concern.

It is noted that the application does not include the supporting noise data anticipated in granting the previous temporary approval. However, the turbine was not emitting any discernible noise during a site visit carried out as part of the previous application process, despite it operating at a rapid pace at that time. Furthermore, the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) has advised that, despite the level of objection to the previous application, no complaints have been received relating to noise emanating from the turbine. The EHO interprets this to mean that the Applicant's assertion that the design of the turbine is inherently quieter than a horizontal axis 'prop' type turbines is correct. The EHO concludes there is no justifiable reason to object to an application to extend consent for a turbine that is clearly not causing noise pollution to neighbouring residential properties.

(iv) Impact on public domain

The turbine is visible in the public domain, between dwellings, from Alameda Road. The resultant impact on the street scene is similar to that from residential properties in Alameda Road, as discussed above, but across shorter widths and from a greater distance. The turbine is close to the public footpath to the rear of the application site. However, mature trees provide screening when approaching from the east and a backdrop when approaching from the west. Therefore, the structure only breaks the skyline for a very short length of the footpath. The footpath is lined with a variety of boundary treatments and buildings and is not of a high visual quality. On balance, it is considered that the development does not have a detrimental impact on the public domain.

8 Conclusion

The retention of the 5.2m vertical axis wind turbine attached to the rear outbuilding would be acceptable in principle, and would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the application site or local area, or on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The application should therefore be approved.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT**

PERMISSION for application APP/13/00870, subject to the following condition:

- 1 The development hereby approved shall be maintained in an entirely non-reflective green finish to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the appearance and character of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 which forms part of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Location Plan 1:1250 Licence No. 100047474

Block Plan 1:500 Licence No. 100047474

Plans Sections and Elevations as Proposed - Job no.0112 Drawing no. 01

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.