

County Hall, Beverley, East Riding Of Yorkshire, HU17 9BA Telephone 01482 393939

www.eastriding.gov.uk

Stephen Hunt Director of Planning and Economic Growth

Rudston Parish Council
Andromeda Lodge
High Street
Rudston
East Riding Of Yorkshire
YO25 4UD

Your ref:
Our ref: 26/01388/STPLFE
Enquiries to: Mr Thomas Parker
E-mail: thomas.parker@eastriding.gov.uk
Date: 27 October 2026

Dear Rudston Parish Council

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
ASSESSMENT)(ENGLAND AND WALES) REGULATIONS 2017 (As Amended)

Proposal:	Erection of a wind farm consisting of 6 turbines (149.9m to tip and 91.4m to hub), 1 met mast (91.4m high), installation of underground cabling, transformer kiosks, construction of crane pads, access tracks and widening of existing vehicular access and associated works [Turbine 1 - 510534, N465648; Turbine 2 - 511084, N465710; Turbine 3 - E511722, N465975; Turbine 4 - E510772, N464846; Turbine 5 - E511340, N465110; Turbine 6 - 511771, N465303 and Met Mat E510941 - N 464790]
Location:	Thornholme Fields Rudston Road Burton Agnes East Riding Of Yorkshire YO25 4NE
Applicant:	Three Oaks REP Extension Ltd

You wrote to me about the above application, and I confirm that your views were taken into consideration when the application was discussed.

After taking all the relevant issues into consideration the Council has resolved to refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):-

- By virtue of its height, scale, massing, siting and proximity, the development would have a high negative impact on the contribution made to the significance of several designated heritage assets by their setting, including the Burton Agnes Hall (listed at Grade I), its Gatehouse (also listed at Grade I), the Church of All Saints in Rudston (listed at Grade I) and the Rudston Monolith (listed at Grade I and designated as a Scheduled Monument). The proposals would therefore result in a high level of harm, and they would not conserve these assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The proposals would also diminish the contribution made by their setting to the significance of two statues within the grounds of Burton Agnes Hall (both listed at Grade II) and the Burton Agnes Conservation Area. It would therefore result in harm to the significance of these assets, and it would therefore also fail to conserve these assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Weighing the public benefits arising from the proposal against this harm, they are not considered sufficient to outweigh this significant high level of harm.

Paul Bellotti
Chief Executive

The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with policy EC5 (part A.3.iii) and ENV3 (part B) of the ERLP SDU and policies HE5 and HE6 of the NPPF in this regard.

2. The application site lies within an area containing known archaeological remains of regional or national significance. In the absence of an appropriate field evaluation, including trial trenching, insufficient information has been submitted regarding the nature, extent, significance, condition and distribution of archaeological remains within and adjacent to the site. Consequently, the Local Planning Authority has been unable to adequately assess the likely effects of the proposed development on archaeological assets and cannot be satisfied that the development would avoid unacceptable harm to heritage assets of archaeological interest, including through their disturbance, truncation or loss.

The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with policy ENV3 (part F) of the ERLP SDU and policy HE5 of the NPPF.

3. By reason of its scale, height and moving turbine blades, the proposed development would constitute a prominent and incongruous feature within the landscape, failing to respond positively to the character, qualities and sensitivity of its surroundings. The proposed development would fail to conserve or enhance landscape character, would not be appropriately integrated into its setting and would result in unacceptable adverse effects on visual amenity for the proposed location within the Yorkshire Wolds Important Landscape Area. Furthermore, in the absence of an adequate Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable cumulative effects on landscape character and visual amenity when considered alongside the consented solar farm development and the operational Fraisthorpe and Lissett Wind Farms.

The proposal is therefore contrary to policies S2 (part H), S4 (part D.11), EC5 (parts A.1, A.2 and A.3.i)), ENV1 (parts A.1, B.1 and B.3), ENV2 (part A) and A2 (parts C.3 and C.7) of the ERLP SDU and policy DP3 of the NPPF in this regard.

4. By reason of its scale, height and proximity of the proposed turbines to neighbouring residential properties, the development would result in an unacceptable adverse effect on the living conditions of nearby occupiers. The turbines would appear as overbearing and visually dominant features in principal outlooks from a number of residential properties, resulting in a significant and unacceptable deterioration in visual amenity and residents' enjoyment of their homes.

The proposal is therefore contrary to policies EC5 (part A.3.i) and ENV1 (parts B.4 and B.5) of the ERLP SDU and the relevant provisions of the NPPF in this regard.

5. By virtue of their height, siting and number, the proposed wind turbines and associated infrastructure would result in unacceptable interference with the operation of air defence radar infrastructure at RRH Staxton Wold and would present an obstruction to low level military flying operations. The development would therefore have an unacceptable adverse effect on air defence infrastructure and activities essential to national security. Accordingly, the proposal fails to demonstrate that it would be compatible with existing defence and aviation safeguarding interests.

The proposal is therefore contrary to policy EC5 (part A.3(iv)) of the East Riding Local Plan Update and policies P4 and P6 of the NPPF in this regard.

Please inform me if you require further details or an explanation of this decision.

The applicant has a right to appeal against the decision and I will write to you again if an appeal is received.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen Hunt". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Stephen" and the last name "Hunt" clearly distinguishable.

Stephen Hunt MRTPI
Director of Planning and Economic Growth