FULL NAME	JOB TITLE	ORGANISATION	CUSTOMER ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	DUTY TO COOPERATE	LEGALLY COMPLIANT	SOUND	WHICH PART	WHICH PARAGRAPHS	WHICH POLICY
Mr Richard Mapletoft	Planning Policy Manager	Rushcliffe Borough Council	Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, Nottingham, NG2 7YG	01159819911	localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk	Yes	Yes	No	Policy, Policies Map, Table		Policy CC3

WHICH POLICY MAP	WHICH DIAGRAM	WHICH TABLE	WHY PLAN NOT SOUND	MODIFICATIONS	HEARINGS	HEARING SESSIONS
Policies Map 2		Tables 8 and 9	Policy CC3 sets out the considerations for assessing proposals for renewable and low carbon installations. Policies Map 2 shows areas considered as "suitable wind energy locations" and "suitable solar energy locations". These areas cover a large proportion of the open countryside to the north and east of the Charnwood. These areas are in close proximity to the border of Rushcliffe. Rushcliffe Borough Council shares Charnwood's ambitions for reducing carbon emissions. We are concerned however that the policy doesn't fully reflect the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for adequate assessment of the cumulative impact of the technologies on the landscape and visual impacts. This is of concern given the large areas of land identified on Policies Map 2 and the vicinity of the southern part of our administrative area. The labelling of the features on Policies Map 2 may also benefit from amendments as currently presented it suggests that the areas shown are suitable, regardless of any other consideration (heritage, noise etc. which are referred to in the first part of the policy). To reflect the policy it may be considered more appropriate to rename the two areas as "potentially suitable wind energy locations" and "potentially suitable solar energy locations". With reference to landscape impacts, it may be considered beneficial to cross refer more directly in the policy to the evidence included in the justification text (particularly table 8 and table 9). The objective of tables 8 and 9 (to highlight those landscape areas of higher and lower levels of landscape sensitivity) is logical, however the content is confusing as currently presented. By way of example, table 8 details that "Langley Lowlands" in the "Low Moderate" landscape sensitivity area could accommodate small scale turbines less than 40m in height. The "High Leicestershire, Langley Lowlands, Wolds and Wreake Valley" areas are then shown in the following row of the table as being suitable for larger wind turbines (up to 80m) even though they are included in the "moderate" landscape sensitivity area, which is a more sensitive area. The same issue follows on Table 9, with the areas of higher landscape sensitivity showing greater suitability for larger installations. Notwithstanding this apparent discrepancy, inclusion of a separate map showing the landscape sensitivity areas referred to in these tables may aid interpretation of the policy (this could perhaps be included in an appendix). In addition, although the policy does refer to the landscape impact and landscape sensitivity study in regards of wind turbines, it does not refer to this in regards to solar. As solar technologies do have a landscape impact, this is considered an omission.	1. Changes to Policies Map 2 - to reflect policy CC3 it may be considered more appropriate to rename the two areas as "potentially suitable wind energy locations" and "potentially suitable solar energy locations". 2. With reference to landscape impacts, it may be considered beneficial to cross refer more directly in policy CC3 to the evidence included in the justification text (particularly table 8 and table 9). 3. Amendments to table 8 and 9 to resolve apparent confusion in the way in which landscape sensitivity areas are currently presented. 4. Inclusion of a separate map showing the landscape sensitivity areas referred to in these tables may aid interpretation of the policy (this could perhaps be included in an appendix)	No	