

Cllr Hugo reinforced the position of the objectors and supported all points that had been raised against the development from the floor. He also tabled a list of planning objections, which echoed those raised by the public.

Cllr Bush had spoken to several residents who support wind energy in general but not this particular development. He advised that the Community Fund is related to installation capacity and not what is actually produced. REG has a track record of selling on developments and therefore there is no guarantee that the Community Fund would endure if the development changed hands. He also wished to point out that the application had been submitted before the data mast has been erected.

Cllr P Wilson had received lots of letters and emails with the majority being against the proposal but some are for or neutral and she advised that some people were reluctant to express their views openly.

Cllr Lyon clarified the issue of the Community Fund, which would be available regardless of permission being granted immediately or on appeal and it would be shared by all affected communities and administered by trustees. It would be split according to impact with smaller amounts for lesser-impacted areas.

Cllr Cheetham also supported all of the objections that had been put forward from the floor. He quoted the National Planning Framework, which is in place to protect and enhance landscapes. He also advised that there are approximately 400 properties looking out onto Berry Fen who will see the development and the closest one is just 700mtrs from the site.

Cllr G Wilson clarified his position as a member of the District Council Planning Committee to ensure he is able to vote at the Planning meeting when this plan is discussed. He advised that a meeting will be held on 16th October to consider the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable Energy and hopes it will be approved on that date so that it is in place before the Planning meeting is held on either the first Wednesday in November or December. Cllr Wilson also advised that it would be best to extract the reasons for refusal from the Local Development Plan.

Having heard the views from the councillors Cllr Lyon then asked the members to consider how they wished to respond to the application.

Cllr Hugo proposed and Cllr Smith seconded that there were concerns about the application. Motion carried by a show of 11 hands. Cllr G Wilson abstained.

Cllr Goddard proposed and Cllr Smith seconded that the plan should be recommended for outright refusal for the following reasons:

1. Non compliance with East Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Policies, with particular reference to:
 - **Policy CS6 – Environment:** Relating to conservation and enhancement of historically important landscapes.
 - **Policy EC5 – Farm diversification:** Farm diversification proposals should not detract from the character and appearance of the area.
 - **Policy EN1 – Landscape and settlement character:** Proposals should demonstrate that their location and scale should protect visually sensitive skylines, geological features, tranquillity of the area and nocturnal character.
 - **Policy EN4 – Renewable energy:** Proposals should not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and amenity, key views and protected species.
 - **Policy EN8 – Pollution:** Proposals should minimise all emissions and other forms of pollution including noise pollution.