

## RESPONSE TO SWAG 'FACT' SHEET



1. **"Should the application be successful here nowhere will be safe"** – in reality the constraints on developing wind turbines are many and varied, making it very difficult to find an appropriate site to develop. Consequently, and contrary to the implications of the SWAG statement, you simply won't see the entire country developed to produce wind energy. Additionally, this site is NOT within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Cotswolds AONB is over 3 kilometres to the east, while the Malvern Hills AONB is over 9 kilometres to the west.
2. **"Wind Turbines attract staggering sums of YOUR money in the form of subsidies"** – a subsidy is money paid by Government directly to an organisation, no such regime exists in the promotion of onshore wind energy development. The system that does exist is called the Renewables Obligation (RO), which requires energy suppliers to source a percentage of energy from renewable sources, and is controlled by Renewables Obligation Certificates (ROCs). A single ROC represents a single unit of energy actually generated by a particular renewable energy generator, accordingly if a wind energy installation produces no electricity it has no income. ROCs are sold to the energy suppliers by the energy generators to meet their obligations, and given that the total amount of actual renewable energy generated is less than the RO, ROCs have a scarcity value.
3. **There is an exclusion zone around the landowner's house** – there is no such exclusion zone. There is however an exclusion zone around the development site, which recognises the issue of cumulative impact and stops that happening by any additional development by Wind Prospect Developments Ltd.
4. **"One landowner involved in this Cluster has recently purchased land from Strensham to Naunton!"** – this land has no connection at all with the proposed Strensham Wind Cluster or Wind Prospect Developments Ltd. Reference to any such private transaction is inappropriate, mischievous and misleading.
5. **"Properties .... will have their value slashed"** – please read the text in the ['Answers'](#) section of the website for our response to this issue.
6. **Lincolnshire council tax ruling** – this ruling did occur, however, as they say the devil is in the detail. The appeal was made predominantly on the basis of noise pollution, and even though the house in question had been subject to two separate independent noise assessments over a number of months, neither of these assessments were presented at the valuation tribunal hearing, nor do they support a claim of noise pollution. Indeed, on the basis that the evidence did not support any claim, the local council had previously rejected the appellant's request for the council to take action against the wind farm operators. While the valuation tribunal did hear the opinions of a number of estate agents, opinions are very different to empirical studies of actual property prices before and after wind farms have been built, as represented by the two studies referenced in the ['Answers'](#) section of this website. The tribunal were not presented with these reports, nor did the council which rejected the noise complaint provide any evidence to the tribunal.
7. **The turbines pose a threat to aviation safety** – the site selection and design process involves consultation with both military and civil aviation stakeholders, the details of which will be submitted with the planning application. These consultations ensure that aviation safety is addressed from the outset, and no stakeholders have to date expressed a concern that aircraft will collide with the proposed Strensham Wind Cluster turbines.
8. **"Tourism will be adversely affected"** – A Scottish study published in March 2008, [The Economic Impacts of Wind Farms on Scottish Tourism](#), found that 97 per cent of tourists said wind farms would have no impact on their decision to visit Scotland, and three quarters felt that wind farms had a positive or neutral effect on the landscape.
9. **In France there is a minimum requirement for a 2 kilometre separation distance between turbines and houses** – this simply is not true. In fact, in France they employ a similar system as in England, whereby the acceptability of separation distances is judged on a case by case basis, and involves consideration of the existing noise environment and how proposed turbines will interact with the existing

## RESPONSE TO SWAG 'FACT' SHEET

environment. Accordingly, in many circumstances wind turbines will be developed using similar separation distances as are being used at the proposed Strensham Wind Cluster.

10. **Noise impacts will keep people awake at night and indoors during the day** – an independent noise assessment has been commissioned and will be submitted with the planning application. Those individuals who attended the wind farm visit in early November will attest that the turbines at the McCains site were barely audible at a distance of 650 metres.
11. **If planning approval is granted for this application it will be harder to fend off future applications** – the planning system operates on the premiss of assessing each application on its own merits. The approval of the Strensham Wind Cluster would establish the need to consider the cumulative effect of any future wind energy development nearby, which would arguably make it more difficult to gain planning permission.
12. **“Onshore wind turbines cost less to construct....Hence the headlong rush....”** – is this really a negative thing? As referred to above SWAG are concerned that onshore wind energy receives ‘subsidies’ (even though we don’t), yet the implication of this statement is that one of the cheapest forms of renewable energy should be opposed. In any event the so-called headlong rush is strictly governed through the planning system, and as noted previously, the constraints on developing onshore wind energy are many and serve to limit where development can occur.
13. **“The land registry have allowed for 6 turbines on this plot of land!”** - The land registry are not a body which provides planning or building permission, and therefore it does not 'allow' anything. This application is for 3 turbines only.
14. **“Not one power station [in Germany] has closed resulting in a negligible drop in CO2 emissions”** – power stations need not close for there to be a reduction in CO<sup>2</sup> emissions, indeed energy from renewable generators directly replaces energy from other sources on the grid. Suggesting that closing power stations is the only way to reduce emissions is akin to saying that to reduce using your car, you have to sell it. In reality, if you made that decision you would walk, cycle or use public transport when it is possible, and only use your car when necessary.
15. **The proposed temporary wind monitoring mast will be clearly visible to residents in Strensham, Ripple and Stratford Bridge** – a landscape appraisal was submitted with the mast planning application. It included a series of photographs at distances of 100 metres, 250 metres, 500 metres, 1000 metres and 1800 metres, and should be available for viewing from Tewkesbury Borough Council. From most locations in the aforementioned villages, the proposed mast will be screened by intervening vegetation, buildings and topography, while from locations with a clear view of the site, at the distances involved, the mast will be a minor element in the landscape.