Community Energy England response to onshore wind permitted development rights consultation [June 2026]

Introduction to Community Energy England

1. This is a response by Community Energy England (CEE), which represents more than 340 community energy and associated organisations across England involved in the delivery of community-based energy projects that range from the generation of renewable electricity and heat, to the energy efficiency retrofit of buildings, to helping households combat fuel poverty.

2. Our vision is of a thriving community energy sector integrated into and truly powering a fair, zero-carbon energy system.

3. Community energy refers to the delivery of community-led renewable energy, energy demand reduction and energy supply projects, whether wholly owned and/or controlled by communities or through partnership with commercial or public sector partners.

Consultation questions

Eligible contexts

1a. Do you agree that a new PDR should be introduced for a wind turbine in non-domestic settings?

Yes

1b. Please explain your answer.

This PDR for non-domestic wind turbines will enable a worthwhile amount of new electricity generation which will often complement existing solar. Farms particularly installed a lot of wind ranging up to 500 kW in size until the Conservative Government de facto ban and the ending of the FiT. The Small Wind sector has languished since but can offer significant savings to farmers and small businesses.

The community wind sector sees far more UK economic value and energy generated potential in DESNZ enabling turbines at and over 750 kW in projects rated to a minimum of 5 MW and see more benefit in DESNZ addressing that gap.

Number of turbines

2a. Do you agree that this PDR should be limited to a single turbine within the

boundary of the curtilage?

No

2b. Please explain your answer.

To make a useful contribution to peak demand of farms and small industrial sites generation of turbines more than ~50 kW would be useful. The average UK farm consumers between 20-150kW at peak times. A dairy farm will consume between 30–80 kW during milking which coincides with highest electricity cost. Poultry / pig (intensive indoor) farming will consume between 50–150 kW throughout most of the day and more during winter months when wind can make its most significant contribution. Arable with grain drying commonly consumes 80–200 kW (mainly during harvest and through the autumn). Refrigeration (and cooling and ventilation) can be high continuous loads.

Additionally as agriculture decarbonises with the electrification of farm machinery, there will be onsite charging demands between the peaks that can use all the generation that can be allowed.

Additional turbines would not significantly impact amenity. Economies of scale in installation would reduce unit cost.

In some cases where demands for power are distributed around a site, several smaller turbines distributed in a curtilage may be more effective, especially if those sites are fed from different substations.

Recommendation: We think 3 might be a good maximum number, with perhaps a presumption of permission if more could be shown to be necessary without undue increase in impact or if the turbines were significantly below the PD maximum.

Size limits

3a. Do you agree with a maximum 30 metre tip height for the non-domestic wind turbine?

No

3b. Please explain your answer.

30 m seems arbitrary and especially so in the context of a curtilage explicitly mentioned in question 2a where turbines should be sited above or away from the immediate turbulence that may arise from a curtilage.

We think the key parameter has to be one tied to assuring turbine structural integrity and good practice of siting. It is extremely important to avoid any requirement that could lead to turbines designed to be taller than 30 m being downsized. Reducing turbine height brings risks especially for safety with potentially greater loading from wind flow over and around obstacles and local topography. It also means artificially lowering generation and economic benefit that would otherwise be possible. A 5 m variation in turbine height at such low heights could reduce energy generation by 10%, severely limiting the economics of a project. Put another way to get the same amount of energy generation would require using 11 turbines instead of 10.

Also, there are very few turbines available below a 30 m tip height that rate more than 15 kW. The Bestwatt 45 and 80 turbines are almost alone in fitting below 30m but this is a very limited range for installers who want to generate up to the PD limits. At 11m/s at hub the 80 turbine can generate 50 kW. We assume that the generation would not be capped at 50 kW but generation up to 80 kW and beyond would be allowed when wind speeds allow. See the indicative demand figures for farms in Question 2b.

The Bestwatt turbines can be installed on 20 m towers but when installed in proximity to buildings which create turbulence, which is particularly impactful on horizontal axis turbines, the higher the rotor is placed the better. On 25 m towers these turbines would top out at 32.9 m so a higher tip height limit would improve performance significantly by around 10% or even more.

There is another turbine of which hundreds are operating in the UK, the Endurance 3120 50 kW. The E3120 has recently been reengineered and is about to be relaunched by the European Green Transition plc Group – which owns Earthmill. The tip height of this tried and tested and well supported machine will be 34.9 m.

There will be a source of second hand turbines and they are fully supported by a 3 company partnership led by Natural Wind. Tip heights vary according to tower height but this example is 32.6m.

Recommendation: Set the PDR tip height maximum at 35m which would in many cases make a really material difference to the efficiency of an installed turbine and facilitate the second hand market in appropriately sized turbines.

3c. Do you agree with a maximum rotor swept area of 200m2?

No

3d. Please explain your answer.

We don't believe it is necessary for a maximum rotor area to be specified. Swept area makes very little difference to visual impacts, but can deliver a significant improvement in energy delivery

The Endurance 3120 turbines mentioned above have a swept area of 290 m2 which increases reliable capture at lower wind speeds. Allowing these turbines would necessitate an increase in the swept area to, say 300 m2 or, better, not setting one at all.

Turbines may come onto the market that use a larger swept area on a shorter tower but don't exceed the tip height limit. This market development should be facilitated by the PDR.

One of our members, Windworks is developing 30 m tall smart vertical-axis turbines. A vertical axis turbine is often more tolerant of turbulent air than a horizontal axis turbine. The swept area of their 50 kW turbine which will be available from 2028 is 175 m2. Their 100 kW turbine available from 2030 will have a swept are of 360 m2. Both these turbines are 30m tip height so will present no more visual or other impacts, than a horizontal axis turbine.

Recommendation: Do not set a maximum swept area. Appropriate turbines on the second hand market and soon to be re-introduce as new, have a swept area of 290m2. Vertical axis turbines may need more even than 300m2.

Additional or larger turbines

4a. Do you think that a PDR should facilitate the installation of larger turbines on a Site?

Conditionally, yes.

4b. Please explain your answer, including any evidence, examples or case studies

that inform your view.

At the scale of turbines with a tip height of 30 m, small changes to tip height, and to diameter make a significant difference to energy yield. Also turbines with larger rotors tend to have the same tip speed and so their rotational speed is lower. The impact on visual impact is at worst small. For example, increasing a 16 m diameter turbine to 17 m is a 6% increase which is barely perceivable visually, but its swept area increases 13% from 201 to 227 m2 and its energy capture by about the same.

Larger turbines can cause opposition. However it is people who live near wind turbines who are the greatest supporters of them and the more that appear the more people will be habituated to them and accept more.

We understand the potential for confusion and cries of 'foul' if the PDR is complicated by multiple conditions and qualifications. However we do need to maximise local generation, especially adjacent to demand. Smart Local Energy Systems can reduce the constraints that might arise and the challenges around connections, and can deliver significant additional local benefits. (see brief case study in 4.c)

Industrial locations are likely to be suitable for taller turbines as there is likely to be higher and potentially rising demand locally and lower landscape impacts

Onshore turbines over 750 kW without rating limit (~10 MW) and in projects of 750 kW to 5 MW and should be the subject of additional consultation which should be progressed urgently.

4c. What types of impacts (positive or negative) might arise from allowing larger turbines to be installed under a PDR?

Positive - more generation and meeting of local demand. More cost effective to install. More turbines already in the market (depending on scale chosen). More opportunities for Smart Local Energy Systems (along the lines of the case study in 19 below).

Negative - ecological impacts especially bats and birds but also soil carbon emissions if installed on peat soils. These can be managed under PDR with sensible constraints on PDR conditions on environmental impacts. Additional noise and visual impact - though turbines are often loved by people who can see them from their homes. Note these impacts are mainly lower per GWh generated, with larger turbines.

4d. Do you think that a PDR should facilitate the installation of multiple turbines on a Site?

Yes

4e. Please explain your answer, including any evidence, examples or case studies that inform your view.

See response to 2b.

4f. What types of impacts (positive or negative) might arise from allowing multiple turbines to be installed under a PDR?

Positive - Achieves more energy generation in appropriate locations, and is potentially enabling for local community energy organisation investments

Negative - Potentially larger zone of visual influence.

4g. If you answered 'yes' to Q4a or Q4d, are there specific criteria the policy could introduce to help determine when more than one turbine or larger turbines may be appropriate?

Not sure how larger turbine is defined so assumed 35 m tip height:

- Meeting new noise thresholds under current Govt consultation.
- Minimum setbacks from hedgerows and other sensitive habitats based on actual turbine dimensions rather than nominal fixed.
- Minimum turbine separations based on diameters and prevailing wind direction.
- Advisory setbacks from residential properties for cumulative impact or noise nuisance.
- Tip height limitation applied.
- Avoidance of physical impacts to heritage assets and watercourses.
- Evidence of consultation approval from safeguarding stakeholders e.g. aviation, telecoms.

4h. If you answered 'yes' to Q4a or Q4d, what criteria, safeguards, additional requirements or approaches should apply to ensure that the impacts of allowing more than one turbine or larger turbines could be effectively managed?

Excluded sites

5a. Do you agree with the proposed list of areas where the PDR will not apply?

No

5b. What, if anything, would you change about the proposed list of excluded areas?

Some sensitive sites should be excluded which should be picked up in the Prior Approval process.

Recommendation: National Landscapes and certain other sensitive designated areas should not be subject to automatic exclusion from the proposed Permitted Development Right. Instead, where a proposal satisfies all other PDR requirements but is located within a National Landscape or other designated area, applicants

should be subject to the Certificate of Lawful Development or similar screening process to determine whether the proposal may proceed under the PDR framework.

This would allow Local Planning Authorities and relevant stakeholders to consider the specific characteristics of the site and the reasons for designation, rather than relying on blanket exclusion. The sensitivity of designated sites varies considerably. For example, some sites may contain features that would be unaffected by a small-scale turbine, whilst others may contain receptors for which a full planning application would be appropriate.

This approach would maintain appropriate safeguards for sensitive landscapes whilst avoiding the unnecessary exclusion of projects whose impacts are demonstrably acceptable. It would also recognise that wind turbines have previously received planning permission within National Landscapes where impacts were judged acceptable.

The planning system should seek to identify and prevent unacceptable impacts, rather than prohibit all development within designated areas regardless of circumstance.

Additional siting conditions

6a. Do you agree with the proposed additional condition to minimise visual impact on nearby heritage sites and important landscapes?

No

6b. Please explain your answer.

Visual impact is subjective. At many historic sites a turbine would have less visual impact than the car park, and power lines. It is no more a 'modern intrusion' than a (noisy) overflying aircraft or passing lorry - which no-one has ever sought to prevent. Many historic sites will consume energy so many wish to make use of the proposed PDR.

Excluding turbines which might be visible from sensitive sites such as National Parks have already prevented otherwise viable projects. We know of examples adjacent to the Weald. This provision would prevent development in a large area which is not justified. If mitigation might result from better siting we would hope the LPA would advise.

The PDR is designed to allow turbines not larger than a large oak tree so, in most cases, the visual impact will be minimal.

Any PDR condition needs to be explicitly defined so that buffers cannot be arbitrarily argued that can greatly increase areas of exclusion.

6c. Do you think the proposed conditions are sufficient to prevent impacts from turbines installed on land nearby or adjacent to designated habitat sites?

Yes

6d. Please explain your answer and provide any evidence you have.

Physical impact upon flora and fauna, again should be controlled by the Prior Approval and the LPA.

However any provisions must guard against LPAs that are not minded to support renewable generation being able to use them as a routine way of rendering development impossible or difficult by imposing regulatory and cost burdens.

6e. Do you think additional conditions are necessary to mitigate radar interference from nearby turbines?

No

6f. Please explain your answer and provide any evidence you have.

One of our expert members writes: “For such scales of development, mitigation options are rarely an option. Our experience is that if a turbine shows up on Line of Sight or PSR, the safeguarding stakeholder will object. It is often a black and white situation, where mitigation will not resolve the conflict. The costs of radar mitigation are disproportionate to the economics of these projects, and not affordable.” Another comments however that “Sometimes discussion with the objecting authority, will under closer scrutiny, remove the potential interference”

It is better instead for across-the-board air safeguarding upgrades to radar systems across the UK, which will unlock a substantial capacity of new wind turbines.”

Buffer distances

7a. Do you agree with requiring a buffer distance of the tip height + 10% from the boundary of the curtilage?

No

7b. Please explain your answer.

This buffer distance does not take account of the needs of specific sites. Examples of turbines falling or shedding blades are extremely rare and in the latter case there is no guarantee that they would fall within the buffer zone. Visual or noise impact is not reduced by this. It would be more appropriate to designate a buffer distance from an avian habitat such as a hedge-row, a lake or a rookery. To reduce impact on more sensitive elements on or near a site it might be appropriate to place the turbine nearer the site boundary although not oversailing it. This of course would be subject to proving no impacts to wildlife from the operation or to humans in the case of turbine failure. Consent from the neighbouring land owner may be required.

7c. Do you agree with requiring a buffer distance of ten times the rotor diameter from the curtilage of protected buildings?

No

7d. Please explain your answer.

The x10 rotor diameter is an arbitrary figure and may have no relation to the impacts that it seeks to mitigate. Small turbines can be noisy and large ones quieter. Small fast spinning turbines can be more eye-catching than larger slower ones.

It would be appropriate to impose a decibel limit at the nearest protected building at a certain wind speed eg 8m/s, at which turbine noise might be heard above ambient noise from the wind itself.

Separation distance

8a. Do you think this PDR should include a separation distance between turbines?

Yes

8b. Please explain your answer. If you have said yes, please also provide views on what you consider to be an appropriate separation distance in metres.

For safety and noise reasons a separation distance should probably be set as some multiples related to the prevailing wind direction, probably of rotor diameter so that it is related to the size of the turbines.

Two or three turbines are not significantly more visually impactful than one. The noise might be multiplied but a decibel limit at protected buildings would control that. Two adjacent farms should not be prevented from having turbines by an arbitrary limit.

There are landscapes in the West Country where there are several small turbines. Whilst they are visible, they demarcate the landscape much as church spires or

towers mark villages. Close up, they are often much more attractive than permitted development barns.

Certification standards

9a. Do you agree that non-domestic wind turbine installations should be certified to the relevant MCS standards?

Yes

9b. Please explain your answer.

MCS standards apply to the installer so are not a direct check on the design, manufacture or performance of the turbine itself. Indirectly, a reputable installer will seek to only install turbines that they were comfortable with, so this offers some protection. For larger turbines, a purchaser would seek type certification according to ISO 614000 IEC 61400-1 – Design Requirements. We wonder if there is a way to get some form of additional assurance for the accreditation of turbines in the 20 kW to 150 kW range beyond a statement of compliance to ISO 614000 IEC 61400-2 Small wind turbines. This could be based on a design assessment, possibly independent engineers examining designs and specific analysis of actual performance expressed as component failures per turbine per year or per rotation.

An example is the American Clean Power (ACP) standard ACP 101-1 2021, The Small Wind Turbine Standard, January 1, 2023 for small, distributed wind turbines (< 150 kW peak power). The Small Wind Certification Council (ICC-SWCC™), which is an independent ISO/IEC 17065 accredited certification body, has accredited 7 turbines.

MCS Certification is vital and the MCS is the best we have at present. The certification of small scale turbines needs updating, ideally from in use experience around reliability. An experienced CEE member has said many turbines “were certified to MCS Small Wind product standard but the certification was no guarantee of reliable generation. In comparison with larger proven turbines such as refurb Vestas or EWT, they are not a reliable investment and I would say it would not be appropriate to raise community funding for many of these.”

Recommendation: The MCS only applies to turbines up to 50 kW so would need to be expanded to turbines at least up to 90 kW for tip heights of 30 m, perhaps up to 150 kW.

Recommendation: Any PDR could require sharing of turbine design data and reliability data with DESNZ such as failures per year or revolution, of safety critical

components such as the tower, yaw mechanism, shaft, blades, and pitch mechanism.

9c. Do you agree that turbines meeting an equivalent standard should be allowed to be installed under this PDR?

Unsure

9d. Please explain your answer.

Provided it resulted in a raising of standards and not confusion or loopholes, the competition may be useful.

9e. What schemes or standards, if any, would you consider as equivalent certification to MCS?

Unsure.

We draw your attention to the American Clean Power (ACP) standard ACP 101-1 2021, The Small Wind Turbine Standard, January 1, 2023 for small, distributed wind turbines (< 150 kW peak power)

The Small Wind Certification Council (ICC-SWCC™), which is an independent ISO/IEC 17065 accredited certification body, has accredited 7 turbines: https://smallwindcertification.org/certified-turbines/

The largest are Irish turbines which we have not mentioned in our response. We note that one of them has a 31m tip height.

ROI; Kodair Wind KW30 (~31.5 kW, 14.1 m diameter, ~31 m tip height) https://smallwindcertification.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/SWCC-22-03-Summary-Report.pdf

ROI; Kodair Wind KW20 (~20.8 kW, 13.1 m diameter, ~26.5 m tip height) https://smallwindcertification.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/SWCC-22-02-Summary-Report.pdf

Visual and environmental considerations

10a. Do you agree with the proposed condition on use of non-reflective materials on blades?

Yes

10b. Please explain your answer.

We believe this is a standard offering - almost all turbines are a colour that is slightly off white.

We believe that there is evidence that including a red stripe on the blade(s) avoids bird collisions. If that is the case, this would be worth mandating.

10c. Do you agree with the proposed condition on removal of the turbine and associated infrastructure when no longer needed?

Yes

10d. Please explain your answer.

It is important that 'end of life' be tidily and carefully provided for. Redundant and broken turbines littering the countryside is genuinely unsightly and damages the reputation of the renewable energy sector among the population. However end of life needs to be provided for as it is an expense when the asset is no longer productive. So ideally properly regulated end of life schemes should be put in place to cover the cost of dismantling or repowering, the recycling or reuse of the asset and the restitution of the land.

Prior approval

11a. Do you agree with including prior approval in respect of siting, impact of the development on the amenity of the area, and land contamination risks?

Yes

11b. Please explain your answer.

In principle this is an appropriate approach, but as mentioned in 6d. LPAs, especially those opposed to renewable energy generation, may seek to use Prior Approval as a full planning process, and thereby deter applications and negate the potential benefits of a less regulatory PDR approach.

The process must be clear, and as light-touch as possible. Each planning authority should have a planning officer trained up to respond, with KPIs as to response times and sign-off.

This will slow down the process but the safe-guards it provides should be worthwhile in ensuring that PDR installations are good quality.

There must be a right to appeal both on a specific prior approval or against a LPA that is not correctly applying the legislation like refusing to conduct a prior approval.

Other considerations

12. Are there any other matters or likely impacts that should be considered if a new PDR is introduced for non-domestic wind turbines?

Environmental Impact Assessment

13. Do you have any comments on the relationship between EIAs and PDRs for smallscale, non-domestic wind turbine installations?

The difference in environmental impact between turbine A and turbine B in your illustration will be minimal. It is external factors such as proximity to environmental elements that could be adversely affected by the installation that are critical. There should be no requirement for an EIA on PDR turbines unless certain conditions are present - which must be clearly set out and relatively easily checked. These should include, for instance, proximity to habitats of flying creatures, foundations being dug in peat soils.

Maintaining current restriction would deter the installation of the larger turbines, notionally permitted by the PDR, and so significantly reduce its benefit. It would effectively reduce the PDR to turbines with a tip height of 23 m.

If the Bestwatt 45 or 80 is installed on a 15 m tower, especially in proximity to farm buildings, trees or hedges, which create turbulence the yield will be significantly lower than if installed on a 20 m or as I recommend in question 3b, a 25 m tower.

Recommendation: Amend the regulation requiring EIA above a hub height of 15 m to 'above a hub height of 25 m'

Existing permitted development rights

14a. Do you think government should make changes to existing PDRs for small-scale turbines in domestic settings?

Yes

14b. Please explain your answer. If you have said yes, please include changes you think government should make.

Current provisions are not working as evidenced by the lack of equipment on the market and the low uptake. Consultation with the stakeholders is needed to explore how to proceed.

Repowering and community energy projects

15a. Do you think government should introduce a new PDR for repowering projects?

Yes

15b. Please explain your answer.

We presume that existing non-domestic turbines would be allowed to repower to the new PDR scale. On that principle there should be a presumption (to some extent contained in the recent proposed amendment supportive of repowering in the NPPF) that sites that fall outside the PDR can repower to at least the level of current output.

15c. Do you have views on how the planning system in England could be improved for repowering (or life extension) projects, beyond changes to the NPPF?

We agree that repowering at scales above PDR should require full planning permission as the changes will often be significant. (If the repowering involves no increase in capacity there should be a presumption of permission, as I think is contained in proposed amendments to the NPPF).

Recommendation: The presumption should be that the site should continue to be used for renewable energy generation and that restitution to prior state should not be required whatever the earlier planning conditions were. Planning permissions on existing permitted wind turbines could be extended to 40 years or given enduring planning permission. Future planning permission should be enduring with a requirement of restitution only at end of use for renewable energy generation. This should be set out in Planning Policy Guidance.

16a. Do you think government should introduce a new PDR for community energy projects?

Yes

16b. Please explain your answer.

Recommendation: The Community Energy PDR should include wind turbines to the same conditions as this PDR. The current 9m square ground mounted solar PDR is woefully inadequate. The PDR should allow solar farms and battery storage projects up to 0.5 ha in area.

This would allow projects that could very usefully complement small-scale wind projects maximising the use of limited grid connections. It would also help decarbonise key local buildings, including supporting the conversion to heat pump heating. We are working with an innovative manufacturer of tracking solar to explore how this can increase early and late yield from solar to help with morning and evening heat demand. It has been proven to help with peak demands on the 'Our Cow Molly' dairy farm. See case study in answer to question 19.

16c. Do you have views on how the planning system in England could be improved for community energy projects, beyond changes to the NPPF?

Recommendation: Community ownership should be allowed as a material consideration in planning.

The planning system focuses on preserving and enhancing environmental, social, and economic factors, particularly for the surrounding community. A community-owned turbine reduces carbon emissions, and can provide energy resilience and financial returns to the community (in the form of lower electricity bills and a community benefit fund). We believe these are significant factors that should be allowed as material to the planning process, particularly where strong community support for a turbine is evident.

Recommendation: "*Add net zero mandates to all relevant regulators that need it, **including in the planning system***" as was promised in this government's Clean Energy Mission p8. The 'purpose of planning' should be *"to achieve net zero as quickly as possible through the means of sustainable development"*.

So far two NPPF consultations have failed to propose this. It would make planning so much clearer. The previous government put in place a net zero mandate for Ofgem.

Recommendation: Resource, support and train LPAs in renewable energy planning and mandate and support proactive engagement with community energy organisations.

It is our members' common experience that planning remains a significant barrier to delivering excellent local projects: "many LPAs remain obstructive, demanding and uninvolved in supporting community energy groups to meet their aims and purposes."

The current requirement for local authorities to 'recognise' that small scale and community led proposals have value is weak and tokenistic. Local authorities should be require to "provide a positive strategy to encourage small scale and community-led…" or alternatively "support the development of small scale and community-led schemes through their policies and decisions".

Recommendation: "Small scale and community led renewables" should be added to the list of exceptions to the Green Belt so they no longer constitute inappropriate development.

Large scale renewables cannot be accommodated in urban areas and finding suitable sites for any free-standing renewables can be very challenging. To

facilitate the decarbonisation of the metropolitan and urban areas with Green Belts we recommend that the Government allows “small scale and community led” renewable energy in the Green Belt.

We also think this change would make a major contribution to ensuring that the proposed new “grey belt” housing developments achieve the lowest possible carbon emissions.

See further recommendation made in our response to the NPPF consultation in September 2024 and the more recent one in March 2026

17. Do you have suggestions for any other circumstances where a PDR could be

used for onshore wind installations?

General questions and evidence gathering

18. Do you have any further comments on the proposals in this consultation?

19. Do you have any further evidence or data to share?

Community energy is excellent at helping good local projects happen and would doubtless find many ways of maximising benefit from the PDR. Smart Local Energy Systems where many elements combine to be more than the sum or their parts and deliver multiple outcomes are a common ambition. Wind and solar are highly complementary, and combine well with other technologies such as battery storage.

For example Sheffield Energy Works are working with Our Cow Molly farm to decarbonise the farm. They have a feasibility study grant from the GBE Community Fund that is looking into how solar, wind, and biodigestion can combine to save money and carbon emissions. If the total generation can be made to exceed 1.5 MW they would install a hydrogen electrolyser making green hydrogen which would be sold to Sheffield bus company to decarbonise the buses that serve the very hilly routes into the Dales that electric vehicles cannot work. Additionally the ReMooable website says “the byproduct of the anaerobic digester (digestate) can be used as a naturally high-nutrient fertiliser, replacing the need for energy-intensive artificial fertilisers. This project will directly reduce the farm’s annual CO2 emissions by over 225,000kg.”

This place-based Smart Local Energy System is the sort of project that community energy needs to be facilitated by planning regulation to do.

The Our Cow Molly farm also has an agrivoltaic trial of 6 Corrie Energy tracking solar panels which yield more energy on a smaller footprint that the rooftop panels, allow more growing because they do not throw a permanent shade, provide shade for sheep, and generation up to 25% more at early and late milking times.

Public Sector Equality Duty

20a. Do you think that the changes proposed in this consultation could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Marriage or Civil Partnership; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation)?

No

20b. Please explain your answer.

The changes to the planning system would not directly affect any protected characteristics.

9. Contact and Further Evidence

Community Energy England is happy to connect you with our expert Community Wind Working Group for further input.

Community Energy England Policy Team

Duncan Law, Head of Policy and Advocacy, d.law@communityenergyengland.org
07958 635181

Community Energy England

Community Energy England (CEE) was established in 2014 to provide a voice and network for the community energy sector, primarily in England. Membership totals more than 340 organisations. Many of the member organisations are community energy groups, but membership extends across a wide range of organisations that work with and support the community energy sector.

www.communityenergyengland.org