

From: Philip Osmond <Philip.Osmond@macegroup.com>

Subject: GCWEP- Levalsa Farm meeting 27th May

Date: 28 May 2015 12:08:40 GMT+01:00

To: Christine Wilson <steweparish@yahoo.co.uk>

Christine

You will be aware of the meeting that took place yesterday, and may have been advised that I have been asked to respond to you with regard to the comments made and the questions raised.

As regards the former, I have included below what I noted as being raised by attendees:-

There were 24 attendees and all were in opposition to the proposals. A representative of the local MP was also in attendance (1 of the 24). He was James Musto, ward councillor for Mevagissey, acting on his behalf.

In terms of the comments, I would summarise as follows:-

- The pinch points highlighted on the application would cause damage to hedgerows. (one person in particular was concerned about his own property). There would also be an enforced clearance of vegetation that would detract from the appearance of the hedgerows. Parsons Brinkerhoff were on hand to explain the process and the comments made by the Highways Agency as consultee.
- There were a number of negative comments about the visibility from numerous locations and the detrimental affect it would have
- There were concerns raised about the closeness of the nearest property and the potential for noise nuisance
- One individual noted that there were no display boards relating to cumulative impact. CSA Architects explained that this was covered within the full application.
- Concerns were expressed of the impact at Penstrassoe Barton, in terms of visual impact and noise. It was noted that the application recommended a residential study, but that this had not been carried out. CSA advised that on that basis, the application noted that the impact was likely to be significant.
- James Musto made it clear that should the application be successful it would

be “called in” and appealed against.

- There were numerous requests for information relating to the revenue that would be earned and the business case generally. Unfortunately this is the subject of a FOI appeal, thus I was instructed not to give any information, as it might have a bearing on that appeal.
- Numerous people felt that there was a disproportional number of turbines already in Cornwall and objected to more. Also many felt that as the local and national targets had been met, there was no need for more turbines.
- Some financial information had been made available by James Musto from a Council report. A number of people felt that the net revenue (reported at £23k per annum) was not worth the upheaval and distress that would be caused.
- A number felt that the address given was misleading, as the site was not located at Levalsa but Tregenna. It was explained by the Council Officer (Caroline Cragie) that this was the address given and later confirmed by the Estates Department. Some felt that this rendered both the consultation process and the application invalid.
- Many felt that the consultation had not followed Council guidance

Challenge was made both to the legality of the consultation and of the planning process. I have made contact both with the Client and Planning Officer to comment and to clarify the basis and standards by which both processes are bound and will report back as soon as I am able.

I have also asked other members of the team for further comments that I may not have been privy to, and will further advise. However, I felt that I would rather advise now as above rather than delay.

I can also confirm that the points above have been submitted to the LPA, as will any further comment.

Regretfully I am on leave from Tuesday next week, and may not have full responses on the legalities before then. This may therefore mean a slight delay before I can advise you, but rest assured I will deal with as soon as I return.

Many thanks

Phil Osmond

Senior Project Manager

ON BEHALF OF CORNWALL COUNCIL

Mace, Suite 3.2, @Renslade, Bonhay Road, Exeter EX4 3AY, United Kingdom