

## **Inspector's response to Document IC4**

The proposed modifications in Document IC4 appear satisfactory, with the following exceptions, which need some further attention.

### **Policy HC1 Built heritage**

The opening words of HC1(2) of the proposed modification ought to add *and/or its setting* to be consistent with the later paragraph on less than substantial harm.

The paragraph on less than substantial harm should refer to *the significance of a designated heritage asset*, in order to comply with the Framework. It should also say "...this harm *will* be weighed against..."

There is a different approach towards non-designated heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 197 of the new Framework. The Council might think about adding something to the policy to cover non-designated heritage assets, although it is not necessary for soundness since the matter is covered by HC1(1)(a)).

The proposed modification of HC1(2) renders HC1(4) redundant. HC1(4) is not reflected in the Framework and HC1(2) is sufficient to cover enabling development. Moreover HC1(4) is internally inconsistent since (b) requires no harm whereas (c) envisages harm. HC1(4) should therefore be deleted. The supporting text might refer to enabling development (see paragraph 202 of the Framework).

HC1(3) should use the expression "*preserves or enhances the character or appearance*" to be consistent with the legislation.

### **Policy CC2 Renewable energy generation**

"Landscape Sensitivity to Renewable Energy in Harborough District", being based on broad-brush landscape character areas, does not have enough detailed impact analysis to give confidence about appropriate locations for this very large scale form of development in the countryside. For example the Welland Valley character area contains attractive countryside, villages and heritage assets, and is only partly under the urban influence of Market Harborough. The policy would confer acceptability on this form of development over extensive areas of countryside without an adequate evidence base.

I am not convinced therefore that there is enough to support the permissive wording for the identified landscape areas, although the

policy could indicate where medium and large scale turbines will *not* be permitted.

In the circumstances it is important to include in the policy the wording in Footnote 49 of the Framework. The policy should say something along these lines: "Wind energy development will not be considered acceptable [and this should apply to all wind turbine proposals, not just the large ones] unless it meets the following criteria; that it has been the subject of consultation; and that it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been fully addressed and the proposal has their backing.. "

Please will the Council take into account the above comments and produce suggested modifications for my consideration.

Jonathan Bore  
INSPECTOR

23 August 2018