

**Report No:** 2RE1  
**Objections:** 2338  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Renewable Energy  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:**  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Copeland has managed to develop the most restrictive and negative policy on renewable energy in the region. This is even more startling when taken in the context of the behaviour of Local Authorities which are moving in the opposite direction. Perhaps the biggest opportunity missed is the requirement which many other Local Authorities have introduced requiring new and refurbished buildings to incorporate renewable energy technology as standard.
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. The Council does not believe policies to be restrictive or negative but reflect local circumstances. Whilst it should be noted that this objection should only be read with reference to 2D changes, the scale of development in Copeland does not warrant the types of requirements suggested.
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** 2RE2  
**Objections:** 2339  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Renewable Energy  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 9.1.4  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Object to the removal of the references to the Council's work carried out in January 2003 with respect to areas of search. PPS22 allows for areas of search and encourages the inclusion of areas which have had developer interest. The Council's work can be argued in both of these situations.
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. The 'Areas of Search' approach is not supported by PPS22 which states that "...Local Planning Authorities should not make assumptions about the technical and commercial feasibility of renewable energy projects.....Technological change can mean that sites currently excluded as locations for particular types of renewable energy development may in future be suitable." (para 1(v)). PPS goes on to say "LPA's should only allocate specific sites for renewable energy in plans where a developer has already indicated an interest in the site, has confirmed that the site is viable, and that it will be brought forward during the plan period" (Para 6) – This is not the case in Copeland and therefore the Areas of Search has been deleted from the Plan.
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** 2RE3  
**Objections:** 2340  
**Support:** 2079  
**Subject:** Renewable Energy  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 9.1.5  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

#### **Objection**

1. Any developer worth his salt will engage with the local communities; however the Council's inclusion of this without specification is not helpful. Further the Council has confused the word developers and utilities – they are not the same (2340)

#### **Support**

1. United Utilities will consult the Council on any proposal as soon as possible. (2079)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

#### **Objection**

1. The expectation for developers to engage with local communities is embedded in PPS22 (para 1(vii)). Further specification would be dependent on scale, type and location of proposed development. The Council does not believe that the new paragraph confuses developers with utilities. The first sentence refers to developers and the second to utility companies.

#### **Support**

1. Support noted
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** 2RE4  
**Objections:** 2341, 2342, 2436  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** EGY1: Wind Energy  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:** EGY1  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## ISSUES RAISED

### Objection

1. Criteria 5 – Paragraph and policy on wind energy should include reference to unacceptable adverse impacts. Any development could be argued to have an adverse impact; the question is – is that acceptable. Further more, there is no account taken in this policy of scale. A building mounted turbine would be treated in the same way as a Section 36 development – this is clearly both unimaginative and unnecessarily restrictive (2341)
  2. Requirement for EIA is not justifiable. Regulations are already in place for wind farms of more 5 Megawatts to do an EIA. Your reference to 2 turbines or 15 meters will stop even small schemes, which may for example have educational benefits - this should be removed.
  3. Object to final paragraph which requires any development of more than two turbines or of a hub height of more than 15 meters to be considered under policy DEV9 which in turn invokes policy ST4 of the JSP. Which only refers to National Parks and AONBs and mentioned hub height of 25 meters, and not in line with the positive tone demanded of PPS22 (2346)
- 

## RESPONSE

### Objection

1. Objection can only be treated in relation to Criteria 5 of policy. It is felt that the phrase “..would not have an adverse cumulative impact” is appropriate. Paragraph 9.2.2 which support the policy also refers to avoiding “..significant adverse affects”. Previous reference to scale deleted and replaced with reference to EIA Regulations as set out in JSP.
  - 2&3. Policy is in conformity with Policy R44 JSP 2<sup>nd</sup> Deposit Version.
- 

## PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

**Report No:** 2RE5  
**Objections:** 2131, 2343, 2345, 2352  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** EGY2: Solar Energy  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:** EGY2  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. National policy is that local landscape designations should not be used in themselves to refuse planning permission for renewable energy development” (PPS22 paragraph 15). The insertion of Landscape of County Importance in this policy is unduly restrictive (2131)
  2. Policy uniquely restrictive - should be no linkage between solar panels and Landscapes of County Importance (2343).
  3. Delete “Landscape of County Importance” to bring in line with PPS22 (2345)
  4. Criteria 3 – Support proposed change in principle but considered wording needs to be more explicit in terms of who needs to be consulted. Recommend include “...on the trunk road network”.
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

- 1-3. Agree reference to Landscapes of County Importance should be removed from Policy.
  4. The term ‘highway safety’ has been inserted as it refers to all highways, including of course those on the trunk road network. It is unnecessary to refer to the trunk road network explicitly over and above this.
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Policy EGY2 – delete reference to “Landscape of County Importance”

**Report No:** 2RE6  
**Objections:** 2309, 2321  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** EGY4: Tidal Energy  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:** EGY4  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## ISSUES RAISED

### Objection

1. Query wording of the revised policy which as a result of the insertion of the word 'no' in line 3 appears to be at odds with the preceding text on page 209. We feel that the policy was expressed more clearly in the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit Plan (2309).
2. Unclear what purpose is behind re-wording of the policy. Whilst benefit in seeking to express Policies in positive rather than a negative way this needs to be justified by the case in point and the detailed wording used. Viability of the proposal remains in doubt whereas certainty of international importance of site is undisputed. Arguably any wording used should, as initially drafted, favour the certainty over the uncertainty. Only sensible approach is to delete Policy EGY4 altogether. Actual wording used is very unclear and when untangled is in fact a nonsense

---

## RESPONSE

### Objection

1. The Council believes that the plan should contain a policy relating to Tidal Energy schemes. It is agreed that the Policy should revert to that put forward in the 1<sup>st</sup> Deposit Version of the Plan although amended 2D references to "tidal energy" and "national interest" should remain.

---

## PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend to read:

Policy EGY 4: Tidal Energy

The Council will not support proposals for a tidal barrage or other tidal energy scheme across the Duddon Estuary unless there are imperative reasons of

overriding national interest which are sufficient to outweigh any damage to nature conservation and other interests. Proposals for all such development will be measured against Policy DEV9.

**Report No:** 2RE7  
**Objections:** 2344  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** EGY5: Waste and Bio-fuels  
**Chapter:** 9  
**Policy:** EGY5  
**Para:** 9.2.8  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Reference to “appropriate scale” is too vague and generalised; who is to decide what scale means? Do you mean physical scale, or commercially viable scale?
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. Appropriate scale will be dependent on a number of factors (and other plan policies) including type and size in relation to surrounding development in the particular location.
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change