

Hearing	Case	Client	Country	Argument	Inspectors Decision	Decision
11-May-11	Spittal	Residents	Scotland	Non-ETSU-R-97 amenity test shows significant impact	Not considered	Refused
				Reservations about background noise	Not considered significant	
				Turbine noise wrongly calculated	Agreed	
				ETSU-R-97 day time limit set wrongly too high	Agreed	
				Night time limit should be 38	Agreed	
No Headroom below limits is problem for enforcement	Not Considered					
05-Mar-12	Rowantree	Residents	Scotland	ETSU-R-97 day time limit set wrongly too high	Agreed	Refused
				Existing wind farm entitled to use all limit.	No comment	
				Wind farms on both sides so no respite	No Comment	
				Non-ETSU-R-97 amenity test shows significant impact	Agreed	
				Cumulative condition not enforceable	Disagreed	
				No Headroom below limits is problem for enforcement	No Comment	
				Conditions not enforceable because two wind farms cannot be separated	Largely in agreement. Seems to have weighed in decision	
Statutory nuisance is not an alternative	No Comment					
26-Jun-12	Druim Ba	Residents	Scotland	Non-ETSU-R-97 amenity test shows significant impact	No comment	Refused
				Reservations about background noise	Not material to his decision	
				ETSU-R-97 day time limit set wrongly too high	Agreed	
				ETSU day limits apply all daytime not just amenity hours	Agreed	
				Night time limit should be 38	Not agreed	

Hearing	Case	Client	Country	Argument	Inspectors Decision	Decision
25-Jul-12	Harelaw	Residents	Scotland	ETSU-R-97 day time limit set wrongly too high	Agreed	Refused
				Turbine noise even if within ETSU-R-97 will be from all directions and so there will be no respite	Agreed	
				Non-ETSU-R-97 amenity test shows significant impact	Agreed	
				Cumulative condition is not acceptable	Not agreed	
16-Oct-12	Straboy	Residents	Republic of Ireland	Assessment standards different from UK but general argument was that background noise not robust and limits too high	Agreed	Refused
23-Apr-13	Turncole	Council	England	ETSU-R-97 day time limit set wrongly too high	Not agreed	Granted
				Turbine noise too low	Not agreed	
				Night limit should be 38dB	Not agreed	
				Non-ETSU-R-97 amenity test shows significant impact	Not agreed	
13-May-13	GSK Montrose	Council	Scotland	Background noise levels not robust enough for proper assessment	Agreed	Refused
				Sound propagation across water not robust	Agreed	
				AM in excess of ETSU limits likely in all wind directions	Not agreed	
				Night noise should be 38	Not agreed	
				Close proximity of turbines means no respite in any wind direction	Agreed	
22-Jan-14	Clocaenog Forest	Council	Wales	Councils' strategic policy for the SSA is that individual applications should meet noise limits less than ETSU-R-97 in order to allow for future applications.	Not agreed	Granted
				Increase in noise levels due to turbines, whilst within ETSU-R-97 limits, would result in loss of amenity conflicting with local plans and in three cases breach Human rights.	Agreed	
				Night lower limit should be same as day (agreed with applicant)	Agreed	
03-Feb-14	Blacklaw X2	Residents	Scotland			Pending

Hearing	Case	Client	Country	Argument	Inspectors Decision	Decision
12-Feb-14	Tullymurdoch	Council	Scotland	Windshield not appropriate	Not agreed	Granted
				ETSU-R-97 day time limit set wrongly too high	Not agreed	
				AM Condition should be provided	Not agreed	
03-Jun-14	Drumadarragh	Residents	Northern Ireland	Cumulative impact would exceed ETSU-R-97. Slightly specialised reasons.	Agreed	Refused
05-Jun-14	Sneddon Law	Residents	Scotland	Cumulative condition is not enforceable	Not agreed	*Granted
05-Aug-14	Bishopthorpe	Caravan Park Business	England	Turbine noise calculation too low		Pending
				Non-ETSU-R-97 amenity test shows significant impact		
				Unacceptable risk of AM		
				Tranquility in outside areas will be destroyed		

\* This was an appeal related to the type of noise planning condition only