

**Heckington Fen Wind Farm
S36 Variation Application**

by

Ecotricity

to

The Department of Energy & Climate Change

for

**up to 22 Wind Turbines with a increased rotor diameter
of up to 103 m whilst retaining consented tip height of 125 m**

REPORT APPENDIX B

Background Noise Surveys (BNS)

Supporting Documents Resident's Submissions.

Wind Turbine Noise Impact Assessment Appraisal

by

John Yelland

MA DPhil (Oxon) MInstP FIET MIOA AMASA

**Commissioned and funded by
local communities comprising:**

Heckington Parish Council

South Kyme Parish Council

Amber Hill Parish Council

Supported by:

Holland Fen with Brothertoft Parish Council

Swineshead Parish Council

Great Hale Parish Council

Local residents supported by:

Heckington Fen Wind Turbine Action Group

Secretary Heck Off

Chestnut House, Maryland Bank, Amber Hill Lincs PE20 3RW

contact email: reply.heckoff@outlook.com

Contents:

1. BNS The Old Church Documentation:

1.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 30-03-16	Page 3
1.2 Covering email from Resident to Hoare Lea 31-03-16.	Page 3
1.3 Hoare Lea response to Resident request for BNS data 04-04-16.	Page 4
1.4 Second Request for BNS data The Old Church. 07-04-16.	Page 4
1.5 Response from Hoare Lea to Second Request for BNS data 7-04-16.	Page 5
1.6 Email from Resident to Ecotricity Old Church access agreed. 04-05-11.	Page 6
1.7 Email from Resident to Hoare Lea confirming agreed BNS data release.12-04-11.	Page 6

2. BNS College Farm Documentation.

2.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 10-03-16.	Page 7
2.2 Second Request for Background Noise Monitoring Data College Farm 05-04-16.	Page 8

2. BNS College Farm Documentation. (Proxy for Caton House Brown's Drove)

2.3 Submission to DECC from resident at Caton House. 12-05-16.	Page 9
--	--------

3. BNS 2 The Council Houses Documentation (Proxy Ashleigh House).

3.1 Submission to DECC by Resident at Ashleigh House. 6-05-16.	Page 11
--	---------

3. BNS 2 The Council Houses Documentation (Proxy Home Farm).

3.2 Submission to DECC by Residents at Home Farm 27-05-16.	Page 12.
--	----------

4. BNS Side Bar Lane Documentation (PROXY)

4.1 Submission to DECC by Residents at Derwent Cottage 25-04-16.	Page 13
--	---------

4. BNS Side Bar Lane PROXY:

4.2 Submission to DECC by Resident at No 2 The Bungalow Side Bar Lane 06-05-16.	Page 15
---	---------

5. BNS Glebe Farm.

5.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 06-03-16.	Page 17
5.2 Hoare Lea Response to BNS Data request 16-03-16.	Page 18
5.3 Second Request for BNS Monitoring Data 04-04-16.	Page 19
5.4 Submission to DECC by Resident 16-04-16.	Page 20

6. BNS Mill Green Farm. (PROXY)

6.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 06-03-16.	Page 22
6.2 Hoare Lea Response to BNS Data request 16-03-16.	Page 23
6.3 Second Request for Background Noise Monitoring Data 05-04-16.	Page 24

7. Communications to DECC.

7.1 Submission to DECC Dr Yelland Re: BNS data requests by residents 24-05-16.	Page 25
7.2 Submission to SoS Amber Rudd by Stephen Phillips QC MP & Matt Warman MP.	Page 26

1. BNS The Old Church Documentation:

1.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 30-03-16.

Hoare Lea Acoustics
Royal Exchange
Cross Street
Manchester
M2 7FL

[REDACTED]
The Old Church
Maryland Bank
Amber Hill
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

30 March 2016

For the attention of: [REDACTED], Acoustic Engineer.
cc Ecotricity Axiom House Station Road Stroud Gloucestershire GL3 3AP.

Subject : Request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect of the developer Ecotricity, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

Dear [REDACTED],

It has been a while, I hope you're keeping well.

Further to tests conducted on my property, and to your letter dated 13 May 2011, which provided an explanation of aspects of the noise data analysis recorded at my property, I would now be grateful if you would forward to me as soon as possible, an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during this monitoring period.

At the time a summary was provided but in accordance to my agreeing access to conduct the tests at the time, I require all data – as was agreed at the time.

Kindly forward the information to email address [REDACTED]

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the developer Ecotricity for their attention and records.
Thank you once again for your kind assistance.
Cheers,

1.2 Covering email from Resident to Hoare Lea 31-03-16.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 March 2016 09:14
To: [REDACTED] <@hoarelea.com>
Cc: [REDACTED] <@ecotricity.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Background Noise Monitoring Results - The Old Church

Dear [REDACTED],

It has been a while, I hope you're keeping well.
I'm following up in relation to background noise monitoring data recorded at my property, The Old Church, [REDACTED] in respect of the developer Ecotricity, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

Further to tests conducted on my property, and to your letter dated 14 May 2011 (copied below) which provided an explanation of aspects of the noise data analysis recorded at my property, I would now be grateful if you would forward to me as soon as possible, an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during this monitoring period.

At the time, only a brief summary was provided but in accordance to my agreeing access to conduct the tests at the time, I require all data – as was agreed at the time.

Kindly forward the information to email address

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the developer Ecotricity for their attention and records.

Thanks once again for your kind assistance.

Cheers, [REDACTED]

1.3 Hoare Lea response to Resident request for BNS data 04-04-16.

From: [REDACTED] <.....@hoarelea.com>
Date: 4 April 2016 at 8:35:27 PM AEST
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] <@ecotricity.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Background Noise Monitoring Results - The Old Church

Dear [REDACTED]
Thank you for your email requesting the raw survey data relating to the Heckington Fen Wind Park that was recorded in 2011. I'm afraid that I'm not able to provide the data to you directly as Hoare Lea do not own the rights to this data. I would therefore recommend that you contact Ecotricity, who should be able to help.
I see that you have copied into your correspondence. I'm not sure if is still involved with this project, so if you haven't heard back from ..., you could also try contacting the Heckington Fen Wind Park project directly, at heckington-fen@ecotricity.co.uk.
Kind regards,

HOARE LEA
ACOUSTICS

1.4 Second Request for BNS data The Old Church. 07-04-16.

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Second Request for Background Noise Monitoring Results Recorded at The Old Church, Amber Hill
Date: 7 April 2016 4:41:54 pm AEST
To: [REDACTED] <.....@hoarelea.com>
Cc: heckington-fen@ecotricity.co.uk,@ecotricity.co.uk

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email in response to my request to receive all of the data recorded at my property, The Old Church in preparation for the submission of Ecotricity's Noise Impact Assessment accompanying their planning application for the Heckington Fen wind farm during 2011.

I acknowledge your comment stating that Hoare Lea 'do not own the rights to the data', yet you have previously provided a summary of some of the data.

I am a little surprised that you appear to have significantly changed your company's stance since that time which followed *good practice* and I note that permission to conduct the tests on my property was only agreed to on the basis that I would be provided all data - you agreed to this as did Ecotricity at the time. This was also restated in the correspondence with [REDACTED] from Ecotricity at the time, which I have re-attached here below again.

I have copied this email also to Ecotricity and again formally request that either you provide the data as requested as soon as possible.

I also refer you (both your company and Ecotricity) to the IoA Good Practice Guide extract referred to in my letter to you which states;

2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.

In accordance with what was agreed in granting you access to my property to conduct the tests, I look forward to receiving the data as requested.

Kind regards - [REDACTED]

1.5 Response from Hoare Lea to Second Request for BNS data. 07-04-16

From: [REDACTED] <.....@hoarelea.com>

Subject: RE: Second Request for Background Noise Monitoring Results Recorded at The Old Church, Amber Hill

Date: 7 April 2016 6:54:09 pm AEST

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: "heckington-fen@ecotricity.co.uk", ".....@ecotricity.co.uk"

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email. Just to clarify my previous email, Ecotricity gave us permission to provide you with the information that was contained within my letter to you of the 13th May 2011, and it was my understanding that the information provided in that letter included everything that you requested at that time, however I can see from your email received this morning that you don't feel that this is the case.

We don't currently have permission from Ecotricity to release the raw noise data to third parties, and the meteorological data was not gathered by Hoare Lea. Ecotricity will therefore need to give permission for the data to be released and provide the meteorological data that you have requested.

I have passed on your request to Ecotricity, however as I'm sure you appreciate, the survey was carried out some time ago now and in the intervening period there have been some staff changes at Ecotricity (for instance, I believe Andrew Muir no longer works there), so I need to find out who the best person to deal with this is. I can see that you have also copied your email to the Heckington Fen project email address, so hopefully someone from Ecotricity will also contact you directly.

Hopefully the above makes sense, and I will be back in contact with you when I hear from Ecotricity.

Kind regards,

HOARE LEA
ACOUSTICS

1.6 Email from Resident to Ecotricity re access agreed to The Old Church. 04-05-11.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 May 2011 16:53
To: [REDACTED]
Cc:@btconnect.com
Subject: East Heckington Turbine Project: Access to Property - The Old Church

Hi [REDACTED],

I own the property 'The Old Church' which is to the East of Ecotricity's proposed wind turbine site on Maryland Bank.

I was given your details by [REDACTED] just now after he approached me requesting permission for access to my property in order to take photographs in relation to the project. [REDACTED] explained that you're heading up the planning for project so I thought I should touch base.

I've granted [REDACTED] access to the property today on the basis that I'm provided copies of all photos taken or data obtained that will be used in the planning submission. [REDACTED] explained that he has gained your approval on that before any photos have been taken. Please note my details below and provide hi res copies of photos/images that will be used by Ecotricity including any manipulated versions developed or adapted from the images taken today.

I also recently spoke with [REDACTED] in relation to provision of access for a noise survey conducted by Hoare Lea Acoustics on behalf of Ecotricity. It was also agreed that in exchange for allowing the survey to be conducted on my property, any data obtained by Hoare Lea would be provided to me which I look forward to receiving when available.

As demonstrated here, I am willing to co-operate with Ecotricity, within reason, in allowing access to my property on a case by case basis and on the basis that I will be provided full copies of all or any data, information, images etc obtained and that it be provided prior to being used in any submissions or proposals by Ecotricity.

Such permission will be reasonably granted on a case by case basis only. As we have now established contact and you have my contact details in full, I would appreciate being contacted at least 48 hours in advance by email or phone to discuss any future visit rather than having your people turn up at my door or entering the property unannounced. In future, if an advance request has not been made I will not permit access to the property.

As requested to [REDACTED] some weeks ago, please ensure I am included in all communications from Ecotricity, be it by email or post, in relation to the project.

I'd appreciate you confirming the likely timeframe I can expect to receive images taken today that will likely be used by Ecotricity.

With thanks,

1.7 Email from Resident to Hoare Lea confirming agreed BNS data release. 12-04-11.

From: [REDACTED] |
Sent: 12 April 2011 11:14
To: [REDACTED] Hoare Lea
Subject: The Old Church

Hi [REDACTED]

Missed your call yesterday but gather you'll be by the property today to retrieve the equipment.

Wanted to say thanks for putting [REDACTED] in touch last week - we had a brief chat by phone and he said he will be happy to provide copies of the data generated from the monitoring system being on site at my property.

It would be great if you can let me know when you expect those details will be available and make necessary arrangements for them to be forwarded.

Many thanks, [REDACTED]

2. BNS College Farm Documentation.

2.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 10-03-16.

10th March 2016
Hoare Lea Acoustics
Royal Exchange
Cross Street
Manchester
M2 7FL

██████████
College Farm
Swineshead Bridge
██████████
██████████

For the attention of: ██████████, Acoustic Engineer.
cc Ecotricity Axiom House Station Road Stroud Gloucestershire GL3 3AP

Dear Sir/s,

Subject : Request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect of the developer Ecotricity, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

I would be grateful if you would forward to me as soon as possible, an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during the background noise monitoring you undertook at my property. I am fully aware that this data was recorded some time ago and appears not to have been made available to me during this time.

However despite this time delay, I do consider I am still entitled to be provided with the data recorded, according to the recently published IOA "Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise".

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the developer Ecotricity for their attention and records.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

██████████

* I refer you to an extract from the published IoAGPG below:

2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.

2.2 Second Request for Background Noise Monitoring Data College Farm 05-04-16.

5th April 2016
Ecotricity
Axiom House
Station Road
Stroud
Gloucestershire
GL3 3AP

██████████
College Farm
Swineshead Bridge

cc to: ██████████, Acoustic Engineer.
Hoare Lea Royal Exchange Cross St Manchester M2 7FL

Dear Sir/s

Subject : Second request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect your company's, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

Further to my letter to Hoare Lea Acoustics, (which was also copied to yourselves), requesting an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during the background noise monitoring they undertook at my property, to assist your planning application.

I would be grateful if you would now arrange for me to have access to this data, as Hoare Lea have declined to forward this to me.

As previously mentioned I am fully aware that this data was recorded some time ago and appears not to have been made available to me during this time by Hoare Lea Acoustics.

However despite this delay, I do consider I am still entitled to be provided with the data recorded, according to the recently published IOA "Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise".

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to Hoare Lea Acoustics for their records.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

██████████

* I refer you to an extract from the published IoAGPG below:

*2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. **It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.***

2. BNS College Farm Documentation. (Proxy for Caton House Brown's Drove)

2.3 Submission to DECC from resident at Caton House. 12-05-16.

For the URGENT attention of :
Keith Welford Case Manager
National Infrastructure Consent
Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
3 White Hall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

Caton House
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

12th May 2016

DECC Contact email: keith.welford@decc.gsi.gov.uk

RE: Ecotricity Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent ref: 4038P019901

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you to advise you of the following details, which I respectfully request are included when reviewing Ecotricity's variation application to increase the overall size of the turbine's blade rotor diameter from the 82m they originally intended to use, to the significantly larger 103m.

I am very concerned that this is now the second time they have attempted to increase the size of the turbine blades, without adequate assessments taking place which does not inspire any confidence that they even care at all about local residents concerns.

I have only recently become aware of this revised application, and I along with many other local residents, now realise that there has been no information provided by Ecotricity informing us that they have even submitted a variation application nor have they advised me of any exhibitions where anyone can view this proposal or submit comments on this new and substantial change.

I was aware that planning permission had been granted based on their Environmental Assessments, which included a turbine noise impact assessment submitted in support of their planning application in July 2011. A Government Inspector examined this information at an inquiry held in 2012 and then based on this, recommended that the wind farm should be consented.

My home, Caton House, is one of the nearest to the wind farm, and only a kilometre from the nearest turbine, T20 is about the same as the distance for Mill Green Farm which we are told is the nearest. Yet Caton House is not in the list of homes where turbine noise was assessed, and no background noise measurements were made here. I know that background noise measurements were made at College Farm, but that is a busy working farm and is much noisier than it is here. The tranquility of the environment is our main reason for living here. It's hard to believe that a wind farm has been consented without any consideration of the plight of one of its nearest neighbours - but it has been. The application for even bigger, noisier turbines if consented will surely be open to legal challenge.

My home both internally and externally has open unobstructed views towards the wind farm site, see the attached photos listed below. The kitchen door opens directly onto the direction of the wind farm. So every time we use this door to access our garden we will be faced with these huge turbines. We also use this area to relax and in the warmer weather often have breakfast and BBQ's outside as it overlooks wide open peaceful big skies fenland countryside with an abundance of birds and wildlife.

I consider that although it appears that the overall height is not to be increased, the larger rotating blades from all 22 turbines will cause further visual intrusion which I consider has not been adequately assessed.

I have not seen any visualisations of how the turbines will impact on the local landscape and therefore I am concerned that not only will my residential amenity be impacted by increased intrusive noise, my visual amenity will be adversely affected as well.

I would be extremely grateful if you would take account of my comments as I feel that Ecotricity should not be given permission to vary the size of their turbines in this way, without any proper notifications or consultation.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,



3. BNS 2 The Council Houses Documentation (Proxy Ashleigh House).

3.1 Submission to DECC by Resident at Ashleigh House 6-05-16.

For the URGENT attention of :
Keith Welford Case Manager
National Infrastructure Consent
Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
3 White Hall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

Ashleigh House

Lincolnshire

06th May 2016

DECC Contact email: keith.welford@decc.gsi.gov.uk

RE: Ecotricity Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent ref: 4038P019901

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you to advise you of the following information, which I consider should be taken into account when considering Ecotricity's variation application to increase the overall size of the turbine's blade rotor diameter from the 82m they originally intended to use, to a much larger 103m.

I have only recently become aware of this application, there has been no local information provided by Ecotricity that they have submitted a variation application or have they informed me of any opportunity to view their proposals or submit my comments on this new and substantial change.

I was aware that planning permission had been granted based on their Environmental Assessments, which included a turbine noise impact assessment submitted in support of their planning application in July 2011. A Government Inspector examined this information at an inquiry held in 2012 and then based on this, recommended that the wind farm should be consented.

I am concerned that the turbine noise assessment in my local area and particularly at my property, Ashleigh House East Heckington may not have been assessed correctly. I was not approached by Ecotricity when they conducted their assessment during March-April 2011 to establish and assess the ambient noise levels I normally experience here.

My home Ashleigh House, is set well back from the busy main A17 and my garden extends further north from it. My garden within Ashley House is much quieter than other properties close to the A17, notably the Council Houses, at which I understand the background noise monitoring took place.

I am particularly concerned that although the wind farm has been consented there was unfortunately no real challenge to their noise impact assessment and that if Ecotricity are now given consent for turbines with even larger blades, then the noise impacts are likely to be even more intrusive and disruptive to myself and local residents.

I would be grateful if you would consider my comments as I feel that Ecotricity should not be given permission to vary the size of their turbines in this way.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted Signature]

3. BNS 2 The Council Houses Documentation (Proxy Home Farm).

3.2 Submission to DECC by Residents at Home Farm 27-05-16.

For the URGENT attention of :
Keith Welford Case Manager
National Infrastructure Consent
Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
3 White Hall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

Home Farm

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Lincolnshire
[REDACTED]

27th May 2016

Your ref: 4038P019901

Dear Mr Welford,

Ecotricity Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent

We wish to inform you of our grievances in relation to Ecotricity's variation application, in which they are seeking consent to increase the overall size of each of the wind turbines blade rotor diameter from the 82m they originally specified, to a much larger 103m.

This application has recently come to our attention via local residents, as we have not been provided with any information on this new proposal by Ecotricity. Nor have they informed us of any exhibitions, public consultation or changes to their construction schedule.

We were aware that planning permission had been granted based on their environmental studies that included a turbine noise impact assessment submitted.

Ecotricity carried out noise monitoring in our local area during March - April 2011. We were asked to participate but involvement was made to seem like we were supporting the Wind Farm. The benefits of directly participating were not explained to us. If it was clear that our involvement would impact the study negatively then we would have accepted.

The northern part of our grounds, where we can quietly relax away from the traffic noise of the A17, are only 885 metres distance from the nearest turbine T6. We now understand that Ecotricity stated in their noise assessment that this separation distance is 998 metres; this is wrong.

We are particularly concerned that although the wind farm has been approved, there was no detailed examination or appraisal of their submitted noise impact assessment at that time. If Ecotricity are now given approval for turbines with even larger blades, then the increased noise is certain to be even more intrusive and disruptive to ourselves and many other local residents.

We thank you for your consideration of this information, as we firmly believe that Ecotricity should not be given consent to vary the size of their turbines without a new and independent noise assessment to correctly determine the impacts on us in our home so close to the nearest turbine and the rest of the wind farm.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

4. BNS Side Bar Lane Documentation (PROXY)

4.1 Submission to DECC by Residents at Derwent Cottage 25-04-16.

For the URGENT attention of :
Keith Welford Case Manager
National Infrastructure Consents
Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
3 White Hall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

Derwent Cottage

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Lincolnshire
[REDACTED]

25th April 2016

DECC Contact email: keith.welford@decc.gsi.gov.uk

RE: Ecotricity Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent ref: 4038P019901

Dear Sir,

[REDACTED] wish to confirm the following information, which we consider is relevant to Ecotricity's variation application to increase the rotor diameter of the turbine blades from the 82m originally specified to 103m.

We have only recently become aware of this application, as there has been no information circulated by Ecotricity that there has been an variation application submitted or that there is an opportunity to submit our views on this variation.

We were aware that planning permission had been granted based on all of the Environmental Assessments, including the noise impact assessment prepared and submitted by Ecotricity in support of their planning application in July 2011. A Government Inspector examined this information at an inquiry held in 2012 and then based on this, recommended that the wind farm should be consented.

However we have been concerned since the original submission of the application that the noise monitoring equipment installed on behalf of Ecotricity on the land to the rear of our property was incorrectly sited, particularly as we didn't understand why this equipment was positioned in this location when we have other neighbours who could have been asked to have the equipment in their back garden.

We were not approached by anyone or asked if the equipment could be installed within the grounds of our property, although if we had been, we would have questioned this, because we had at that time in March/April 2011 a large flock of chickens, who had the run of part of our grounds right up to the rear boundary fence, only a few feet away from the noise monitoring equipment. We also had 2 cockerels who like the chickens, created a fair amount of noise throughout the day and evening until dark, especially when the hens were laying or the cockerels were crowing.

We have only just seen the photos taken of the monitoring equipment in March 2011 photos C13 - C16* (attached) which do not reveal how close the monitoring equipment was to the back wall of our garage, which forms part of the rear boundary of our property, backing on the land where the wind farm is due to be sited.

The greenhouse in photo C13 butting up to our boundary fence, was in fact next to our garage. This green house has since been taken down and we no longer have any chickens or cockerels, so our local noise levels are now much lower. This is a fairly quiet area, even more so when there is little traffic travelling along Side Bar Lane in the evenings and weekends.

We now have serious reservations as to the legitimacy and acceptability of the noise assessment conducted at Side Bar Lane and remain very worried that it could be used to justify the consent of turbines with even larger blades, which by their very nature are likely to create greater noise impacts.

We have attached the following photos:

- 1. DC 1 which shows the rear of our property with our garage and the noise monitoring equipment location.**
- 2. DC 2. Photo of some of our chickens**
- 3. DC3 Photo of some of our chickens.**
- 4. DC4 Photo of some of our chickens close to the rear boundary fence.**
- 5. Ecotricity's submitted photos C13-C16 of the noise monitoring location taken by them in March 2011.**

We would be grateful if you could forward our comments as soon as possible to the Secretary of State, as we believe that this information also calls into question the acceptability of the noise assessment on which the Inspector based his decision to approve the wind farm.

Thank you.

Kind regards.

[REDACTED]

4. BNS Side Bar Lane PROXY:

4.2 Submission to DECC by Resident at No 2 The Bungalow Side Bar Lane 06-05-16.

For the URGENT attention of :
Keith Welford Case Manager
National Infrastructure Consent
Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
3 White Hall Place
LONDON
SW1A 2AW

No 2 The Bungalow
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Lincolnshire

06th May 2016

DECC Contact email: keith.welford@decc.gsi.gov.uk
RE: Ecotricity Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent ref: 4038P019901

Dear Sir,

"I am a councillor of Heckington Parish and Heckington Fen is part of the parish I represent. [REDACTED] backs onto and overlooks the land which surrounds Six Hundred Farm, Six Hundred Drove, East Heckington, which is the proposed site of Heckington wind farm.

My immediate neighbours along this eastern wind farm side of Side Bar Lane consists of just five properties; two detached houses positioned between three bungalows. My home is the middle bungalow of the three in our short row of properties and at either side of the two detached houses, both to the north and south, there is just open farm land. Opposite my bungalow on the western side of Side Bar lane there is a large farmhouse and stables.

The nearest turbines of the consented site plan of the wind farm are shown to be approximately 1140 metres distance from our homes.

Our hamlet is very quiet, although the road can be periodically busy during normal business hours in the day. During the evenings and weekends the passing traffic is much more infrequent.

I am now aware having belatedly had access the Noise Impact Assessment provided to our Parish Council, that in March/April 2011 noise monitoring equipment was positioned on land behind our properties, to I understand, monitor normal noise levels and conditions at that time.

The data recorded was for Ecotricity (the wind farm developers) in support of their wind farm planning application Noise Impact Assessment submitted in July 2011, which as a Parish Councillor I know has been consented by DECC.

However, I have only recently learned that other monitoring equipment was installed at nearby Glebe Farm further north along Side Bar Lane and, most surprisingly, on land behind Derwent Cottage, our northern most neighbour (next door but one), along our side of Side Bar Lane.

I understand this was done by a company called Hoare-Lea. Whilst I appreciate no planning permission was required to install the equipment, I think that I, and my adjacent neighbours, should at least have been approached by Hoare-Lea, as this monitoring linked in with the proposed wind farm development. It is now apparent that no such approach was made either to myself or any of my neighbours. It is my belief that if we had been approached, bearing in mind the equipment was meant to aid the wind farm development, we could have been helpful, however, this was not to be.

Furthermore I am extremely concerned to note that there is a contrary statement contained within the Noise Monitoring Information Sheet Appendix 10 C for Side Bar Lane, which states:

"This monitoring location was selected to provide representative background noise levels from the properties towards the south end of Side Bar Lane, The meter was not located in the amenity space of a residential property as access permissions could not be agreed".

Perhaps if Hoare-Lea had been honest and open in the first instance, we would at least have confidence that their monitor was sited for everyone's benefit, unfortunately it now seems that this was not the case.

Since that time, many of us have become aware of the concerns caused by wind farms, particularly turbine noise and AM. It should not surprise anyone, therefore, that there is significant opposition to this wind farm and the concerns raised by parishioners are legitimate and well founded, based on increasing corroborated evidence worldwide that harm is being caused to local residents at least within 1-3 km from the wind farm and in some cases further afield.

Likewise serious concerns being raised with regards to this wind farm, based upon the adverse noise levels that we consider would occur at this site, particularly an increased risk of unacceptable levels of AM as direct cause from an increase in the turbines blade rotor diameter from 90m to 103 m. We are aware of mounting evidence that, AM is also the cause of health problems to local residents, despite the developer's saying otherwise.

The larger turbine blade configuration would also increase the visually intrusive nature of the wind farm and be detrimental to the landscape character of the surrounding countryside for up to at least 5-7 km. These 22 huge turbines would have a massive visual impact.

I forward this letter for your information and wish this to be taken into consideration.

Yours faithfully



Attached:

1. Side Bar Lane Noise Monitoring Location Photo 1 No 2 The Bungalow Residential Amenity Area within the grounds of No 2 The Bungalow Looking South East towards wind farm site. Lawn Suitable as Noise Monitoring Location.
2. Side Bar Lane Noise Monitoring Location Photo 2 . No 2 The Bungalow (NIA NML Proxy rear of Derwent Cottage) Residential Amenity Area within the grounds of No 2 The Bungalow Looking East directly towards wind farm site. Lawn Suitable as Noise Monitoring Location.
3. Side Bar Lane Noise Monitoring Location Photo 3. No 2 The Bungalow Rear Residential Amenity Area within the grounds of No 2 The Bungalow Looking South East towards wind farm site. Lawn Suitable as Noise Monitoring Location.

5. BNS Glebe Farm.

5.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 06-03-16.

6th March 2016

Hoare Lea Acoustics

Royal Exchange

Cross Street

Manchester

M2 7FL

[REDACTED]
Glebe Farm

Side Bar Lane

For the attention of: [REDACTED], Acoustic Engineer.

cc Ecotricity Axiom House Station Road Stroud Gloucestershire GL3 3AP

Dear Sir/s,

Subject : Request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect of the developer Ecotricity, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

I would be grateful if you would forward to me as soon as possible, an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during the background noise monitoring you undertook at my property. I am fully aware that this data was recorded some time ago and appears not to have been made available to me during this time.

However despite this time delay, I do consider I am still entitled to be provided with the data recorded, according to the recently published IOA "Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise".

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the developer Ecotricity for their attention and records.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

* I refer you to an extract from the published IoAGPG below:

2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.

5.2 BNS Glebe Farm: Hoare Lea Response to BNS Data request 16-03-16.

Direct Dial: +44 (0) 161 834 4754

Email:

Ref: LET-ECO-10-03820-JS-160316-2



Glebe Farm

Tel + 44 (0) 161 834 4754
Fax + 44 (0) 161 834 4762

Royal Exchange
Cross Street
Manchester M2 7FL

16 March 2016

Dear [REDACTED]

RE: REQUEST FOR SURVEY DATA – HECKINGTON FEN WIND PARK

Thank you for your recent letter requesting the raw survey data related to the Heckington Fen Wind Park that was recorded in 2011.

Unfortunately, Hoare Lea do not own the rights to this data, therefore we are unable to provide it to you directly. We would therefore recommend that you forward your request on to Ecotricity, who should be able to help. The Heckington Fen Wind Park project can be contacted directly by email at heckington-fen@ecotricity.co.uk.

Yours sincerely,
For and on Behalf of
HOARE LEA ACOUSTICS

[REDACTED]
Executive Acoustic Engineer

www.hoarelea.com

A list of Partners is available on our website



5.3 BNS Glebe Farm: Second Request for BNS Monitoring Data 04-04-16.

4th April 2016

Ecotricity

Axiom House

Station Road

Stroud

Gloucestershire

GL3 3AP

[REDACTED]
Glebe Farm

Side Bar Lane

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

cc to: [REDACTED], Acoustic Engineer.

Hoare Lea Royal Exchange Cross St Manchester M2 7FL

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject : Second request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect your company's, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

Further to my letter to Hoare Lea Acoustics, (which was also copied to yourselves), requesting an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during the background noise monitoring they undertook at my property on your behalf.

I wish to again reiterate my request to have access to this data, as Hoare Lea have since declined to forward this to me.

I am fully aware that this data was recorded some time ago and appears not to have been made available to me during this time by Hoare Lea Acoustics.

However despite this time delay, I still consider I am still entitled to be provided with the data recorded, according to the recently published IOA "Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise".

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to Hoare Lea Acoustics for their records.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

* I refer you to a extract from the published IoAGPG below:

*2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. **It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.***

5.4 BNS Glebe Farm: Submission to DECC by Resident 16-04-16.

For the URGENT attention of :
Keith Welford Case Manager
National Infrastructure Consents
Department of Energy & Climate Change (DECC)
3 Whitehall Place
LONDON SW1A 2AW

[REDACTED]
Glebe Farm
Side Bar Lane
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

16th April 2016

DECC Contact email: keith.welford@decc.gsi.gov.uk

RE: Ecotricity Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent ref: 4038P01990

Dear Sir,

I wish to confirm I have only recently, (this week) had the opportunity to review the outcome of the noise monitoring undertaken at my property, Glebe Farm, which formed part of the noise impact assessment submitted on behalf of the developer Ecotricity, by Hoare Lea Acoustics in support of their planning application for the Heckington Fen Wind Farm dated July 2011.

I wish to make the following comments:

1. I was approached by a representative of Hoare Lea to gain access and my permission to install noise monitoring equipment at Glebe Farm during March 2011.
2. I had no issues in agreeing to have the equipment installed, although I was given no covering documentation or background information or explanation at the outset of the installation informing me of any appropriate restrictions or curtailment of my daily activities, whether usual or out of the ordinary, at the outset of the installation.
3. I confirm the representative-technician installed two sets of noise monitoring equipment at my property, and not just one set as shown in the Noise Monitoring Information sheets (Appendix 10 C) in the original Heckington Fen Wind Park Environmental Statement, dated July 2011.
4. I am also confident that this monitoring equipment was installed for a maximum period of time extending to no longer than 14 days, and not for the full period of time specified in the Data Collected File HEC & HEC2, covering a 5 week period which identified 3 separate data collection times:

HEC: 01/03/11 10.10 – 10/03/11 - 20.00

HEC2: 15/03/11 14.10 – 29.0311 – 12.20

HEC2: 29/03/11 12.40 – 07/04/11 - 22.50

5. I am confident that one of the sets of monitoring equipment was installed for a period of no more than 14 days. The other set functioned for less than 10 days, as the technician called 10 days after installation to check the equipment, and found that the battery was flat. He therefore removed this set of equipment.

6. The equipment was not installed in the location shown in photo C17, C18, C19 or C20.

I was surprised to see these photos in the assessment, as I was not aware that any had been taken. I did notice that the technician spent time in the general area where the photo was taken, assembling the equipment ready to be installed, but as I was busy I did not remain with him and walked away. The equipment was simply not left at the location indicated by the photos.

7. The actual locations of the noise monitoring equipment is shown in the attached photos (A & B) marked by an upright pitch fork.

8. One set of monitoring equipment was located in the corner of the eastern most paddock within the boundary of my property to which see the aerial map position A. This paddock also forms a section of my eastern boundary.

9. The other set of equipment was located further along this eastern boundary to the north of monitoring location A, see monitoring location marked B.

I would also point out that the equipment (B) was installed on a long raised bank of soil which extended along the whole length of the eastern boundary. Note this bank is visible on the aerial photo.

10. During the entire period of the noise monitoring, I was in the process of removing and spreading the soil content of the bank in the immediate vicinity of the noise monitoring equipment B and close to equipment A, with a large mechanical digger which I still own, see attached photo. I mentioned this to the technician who installed the equipment, as it occurred to me that the significant levels of noise both the digger and the soil movement were causing, would definitely increase noise levels to be way above the normal levels of noise experienced at my property. This is a quiet rural location, despite being located near a local road where the local traffic noise is not particularly intrusive or noticeable.

I asked the technician about the digger noise. I clearly recall his response, which was that it could be identified and excluded from the noise monitoring data recorded, when analysed. I understand that it was not excluded. I worked with the digger from dawn to dark and at weekends.

This letter is a true record of the installation of the noise monitoring equipment and the conditions present during the period of noise monitoring.

Yours sincerely



6. BNS Mill Green Farm. (PROXY)

6.1 Copy letter to Hoare Lea requesting BNS data. 06-03-16.

06 March 2016

Hoare Lea Acoustics

Royal Exchange

Cross Street

Manchester

M2 7FL

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Mill Green Farm
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

For the attention of: [REDACTED], Acoustic Engineer.

cc Ecotricity Axiom House Station Road Stroud Gloucestershire GL3 3AP

Dear Sir/s,

Subject : Request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect of the developer Ecotricity, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

I would be grateful if you would forward to me as soon as possible, an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during the background noise monitoring you undertook at my property. I am fully aware that this data was recorded some time ago and appears not to have been made available to me during this time.

However despite this time delay, I do consider I am still entitled to be provided with the data recorded, according to the recently published IOA "Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise".

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to the developer Ecotricity for their attention and records.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

* I refer you to an extract from the published IoAGPG below:

2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.

6.2 BNS Mill Green Farm: Hoare Lea Response to BNS Data request 16-03-16.

Direct Dial: +44 (0) 161 834 4754

Email:

Ref: LET-ECO-10-03820-JS-160316-1



Mill Green Farm

Tel + 44 (0) 161 834 4754
Fax + 44 (0) 161 834 4762

Royal Exchange
Cross Street
Manchester M2 7FL

16 March 2016

Dear

RE: REQUEST FOR SURVEY DATA – HECKINGTON FEN WIND PARK

Thank you for your recent letter requesting the raw survey data related to the Heckington Fen Wind Park that was recorded in 2011.

Unfortunately, Hoare Lea do not own the rights to this data, therefore we are unable to provide it to you directly. We would therefore recommend that you forward your request on to Ecotricity, who should be able to help. The Heckington Fen Wind Park project can be contacted directly by email at heckington-fen@ecotricity.co.uk.

Yours sincerely,
**For and on Behalf of
HOARE LEA ACOUSTICS**

Executive Acoustic Engineer

www.hoarelea.com

A lot of Papers is available on our website



6.3 BNS Glebe Farm: Second Request for Background Noise Monitoring Data 05-04-16.

5th April 2016
Ecotricity
Axiom House
Station Road
Stroud
Gloucestershire
GL3 3AP

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Mill Green Farm
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

cc to: [REDACTED], Acoustic Engineer.
Hoare Lea Royal Exchange Cross St Manchester M2 7FL

Dear Sir,

Subject : Second request for background noise monitoring data recorded at the above address in respect your company's, Section 36 National Infrastructure application to the Department of Energy & Climate Change & Consultee North Kesteven District Council: Ref No 09/1067/S36 dated 15th December 2009 for a wind turbine power station at Six Hundred Farm Six Hundred Drove East Heckington Lincolnshire.

Further to our letter to Hoare Lea Acoustics, (which was also copied to yourselves), requesting an electronic copy of all the raw wind, noise and rain data collected during the background noise monitoring they undertook at our property on your behalf.

We wish to again reiterate our request to have access to this data, as Hoare Lea have regrettably declined to forward this to us.

We are fully aware that this data was recorded some time ago and appears not to have been made available to us during this time by Hoare Lea Acoustics.

However despite this time delay, we still consider we are entitled to be provided with this data, according to the recently published IOA "Good Practice Guide to the Application of ETSU-R-97 for the assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise".

A copy of this letter has been forwarded to Hoare Lea Acoustics for their records.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

* We again refer you to an extract from the published IoAGPG below:

*2.2.8 When potential monitoring locations within a property's curtilage have been identified, access to install equipment has to be requested. Obtaining access for noise monitoring may be the first time residents hear about the development, therefore any requests for access should ideally be made by the land-owner or project representative and may be accompanied by written material describing the development and if necessary the noise monitoring process with a photo of a typical installation. This may include a note that the risks of theft/damage of the equipment are carried by the consultant/developer and not the householder. **It is considered to be good practice to provide the noise and meteorological data available, to the resident upon request.***

7. Communications to DECC.

7.1 Letter to DECC from Dr Yelland Re: BNS data requests by residents 24-05-16.

John V Yelland MA DPhil (Oxon) MInstP FIET AMASA MIOA

Independent Consultant Acoustics and Electrical Engineering for Wind Farms

For the attention of : Keith Welford Case Manager National Infrastructure Consents Department
of Energy & Climate Change 3 Whitehall Place LONDON SW1A 2AW

DECC Contact email: keith.welford@decc.gsi.gov.uk

Dear Mr Welford,

Heckington Fen Wind Farm Variation of Consent Application ref: 4038P019901

I have been commissioned by the local communities, which include the following Local Parish Councils: (Heckington, South Kyme, Amber Hill, Brothertoft and Holland Fen, Swineshead and Great Hale) to review the applicant's noise impact assessment for the above project.

I have very serious doubts in particular about the validity of the background noise surveys on which it is based. To fully evaluate them I need the raw noise and meteorological data which was gathered over the duration of the survey conducted in March - April 2011.

The firm contracted to undertake the noise impact assessment was Hoare Lea Acoustics; in the past, for projects other than the present one, Hoare Lea have complied with the requirement of §2.2.8 of the IOA Good Practice Guide to supply data to residents whose properties were surveyed, and have indeed supplied me directly with the data gathered from all surveyed properties. On this occasion they have refused to deliver the data to residents when requested to do so by letter, on the basis that it is the property of the applicant, Ecotricity. Residents of the surveyed properties have therefore written to Ecotricity repeating the request, but Ecotricity have not responded to their letters sent over 6 weeks ago.

In the interests of transparency, may I ask you to encourage Ecotricity to comply with the planning guidance in the Good Practice Guide and supply electronic copies of the raw noise and met data to residents forthwith. I will need several weeks to process the data and report on it, so further delays would hardly be in Ecotricity's interest. If the data continues to be withheld we, and ultimately the project decision-maker, must draw the obvious conclusion.

I expect my report to be delivered to DECC by 30th May 2016; it will however be subject to revision when I have reviewed the data gathered during the background noise survey.

Yours sincerely

Dr J V Yelland

Enc: copies of referenced requests.



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

The Rt Hon Amber Rudd MP
Department of Energy and Climate Change
3 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW

14th June 2016

Dear Secretary of State,

You will no doubt be aware of the Heckington Fen Wind Farm S36 Variation Application, which has caused a great deal of concern within the affected local communities in our constituencies. A grouping of local affected Parish Councils and residents has commissioned Dr John Yelland, a highly qualified and respected acoustician, to investigate the Noise Impact Assessment, submitted as an integral part of the original planning application and his report has now been submitted to your department.

Dr Yelland's report makes for concerning reading. He finds that, amongst other defects, the background noise surveys that were carried out were deeply flawed. These are the background noise measurements made at a number of homes close to any proposed wind farm, typically over a period of four weeks, and are fundamental to the creation of any valid noise impact assessment report.

The original consent was nevertheless granted, in spite of the applicant's use of defective and non-compliant noise data. Dr Yelland concludes that the project in its original form would already have significantly exceeded the Government's permitted noise limits. If the variation application were granted relying on the original noise impact assessment the project would exceed those limits by an even greater margin.

In the light of Dr Yelland's report the District Council, (North Kesteven District Council) are investigating the implications arising from this and would therefore benefit from the call for compliant background noise surveys to be carried out jointly by the developer's chosen independent noise consultant and Dr Yelland. The six Parish Councils and community resident's action group would also support this course of action.



The data produced from this survey would be analysed and reported jointly if both these parties are in agreement or separately if they are not. By independent we mean acousticians who are not predominantly employed by or contracted to the wind energy industry. This would allow for your officials to have full knowledge of the facts before coming to a decision.

We write to make you aware of our concern as Members representing the affected communities, and we would be grateful for your assurance that the report, and our requests for further background noise surveys and noise impact assessment(s), will be fully taken into account before any decision is considered or made.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns, and we look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours Sincerely

Matt Warman MP
Boston and Skegness

Stephen Philips QC MP
Sleaford and North Hykeham