

acceptable and request additional information and calculations are presented by the applicant to justify the scheme benefits.

19 . Section 2 - Environmental Statement

Section 2.3 of the LUC document states:

Overall the review found that "the ES is considered to provide sufficient information for the Council to assess the potential significant impacts of the proposed development on the environment" (paragraph 2.2). As such, no further information is provided in response to this review.

Another word for 'sufficient' is 'adequate' and for a development of this magnitude and impact, 'adequate' simply is not good enough. We would draw your attention to the following points taken from the summary of the Nicholas Pearson Associates (NPA) Environmental Statement Review:

- 5.1 Overall the ES is considered to provide sufficient information for the Council to assess the potential significant impacts of the proposed development on the environment, **however areas have been identified that would benefit from clarification or additional information.**
- 5.2 Matters identified in this report as **shortcomings within the ES requiring additional information** are identified in section 3. Section 4 reviews consultee comments and **identifies where further information is required** and whether these requests fall under Regulation 22 of the EIA regulations.
- 5.3 The above issues **should be considered by the Council before determining the planning application**

20. Impact on ecology - Trees

The reasons given by REG/LUC do not justify the removal of healthy oak trees to provide site access. Paragraph 4.3 states that "they would be more than happy to provide additional planting of appropriate tree species to compensate for this loss." **The planting of young saplings will not compensate for the loss of these 50 year old oak trees".**

21. Impact on ecology – Ornithology

Paragraph 5.3 suggests there was supposed to be a meeting between Steve Percival, Natural England, RSPB and WWT to discuss the Swan Management Scheme, **but it would appear that Steve Percival has so far only met with Natural England.**

We also note in an email from the RSPB dated 6th February 2015 that:

"The RSPB's recommendation regarding appropriate mitigation being identified to avoid impacts on raptors has not been addressed and therefore also still stands"

No mitigation regarding the impact on raptors has been supplied, so this objection from the RSPB is still outstanding.

The following comments regarding the suggested Swan Management scheme as outlined in the LUC consultation responses document come from Paul Mason, a respected local ornithologist:

"There is no great difference in the applicant's submission as it still chooses to ignore behaviour of the Whooper and Bewick's swans in changing diet to wheat and rape in each New Year and early winter annually. This would mean the birds could land on fields anywhere near the wind turbines and be in danger of flying into them especially in take-off.

Further it continues to state that all land in the vicinity of the proposed site of the three turbines. A look at the map where the applicants land is coloured green proves the point. What about the land not coloured? It does not say that 3 other landowner/farmers are included in that.

We believe the Swan Management Scheme proposed, will not ensure that any feed put out to lure them away from the wind turbines will work with any certainty and we are not aware of any existing proven scheme."