



COUNCIL MEETING – 16 July 2014

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION

From: Councillor Wright

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“I asked for and planning officers agreed, along with members and other council officers for a paragraph 1.12 from the CAA CAP 764 Issue 5, the CAA Policy and guidelines on Wind Turbines to be included within the planning officers report for the Bullington Wind Farm application 13/00800/FUL Can you explain why this paragraph was split into two parts with other items between with a reference note referring to the other part as shown.”

1.12 In all cases, regardless of the status of the aerodrome, any development that causes pilots to experience – or simply perceive – an increase in difficulty when using an aerodrome may lead to a loss of utility. **GAP 1 PAGE - 6 PARAGRAPHS** The CAA considers that if the Aerodrome Manager (or equivalent) advises that the aerodrome’s established amenity would be affected by a development, their advice can generally be considered as expert testimony. However, such comment requires robust evidence, and may be subjected to scrutiny by the CAA (or any other party with equivalent expertise), should disagreement between the aviation operator and the wind energy developer arise. It is accepted that an Aerodrome Manager is competent until proved otherwise, and that the CAA licensing process would prevent an incompetent person from managing a licensed aerodrome. Note that the CAA has no regulatory oversight of unlicensed aerodromes.

Reply

“The guidance set out in the CAA document was provided in paragraphs 13.16 and 13.17 of the report. 13.16 is a quote from comments made by the CAA received by Basingstoke and Dean in relation to another wind farm proposal but, as they were generic in nature, were included in the Bullington report. 13.17 quotes directly from paragraph 1.12 of the guidance and the text included in the report follows on from that referred to by the CAA at 13.16 above.

Having spoken to the Assistant Director (Environment), I understand that the author of the report wished to quote the Basingstoke and Deane response in the report in any event (which he did in paragraph 13.16), and then go on to quote paragraph 1.12 of the CAA publication. However, as the Basingstoke and Deane response (including the partial quote) had already appeared, there was little point in re-quoting the first part of the paragraph again.

The paragraph was quoted in full as you had originally requested. The reason it appeared to have been split was purely to avoid unnecessary repetition.”