

To: Mr. P. Asquith / Examining Authority
for the Mynydd y Gwynt proposed wind farm.

Tuesday 14th April 2015

**Response to ExA's request for information of 3rd April 2015
to meet Deadline VII (16th April 2015).**

Sir,

As the Examination moves toward your issue of the revised dDCO on the 24th April I think it is vital that all the Developer's facts are correct. I am aware that in your last request for information that you asked for a response, in that instance only from the Developer, as to the Company's financial viability. Would you, however, allow me to draw your attention to the following from their response to this particular request [MYG Note on Financial Viability, paragraph 1 starting line 7, submitted for Deadline VI 26th March 2015].

- 1.1 I find that MyG have increased the number of turbines on site to 29 – I quote “to produce as much electricity as this site's 29 turbines.” Throughout the Examination we have been led to understand that this project is for -“Up to 27 turbines” [in for instance, 'About this project' – NIP Home Page for the development]. If the '29 turbines' is a typographical error then I suggest that MyG, at this critical stage of the Examination, should take more care in preparing their submissions. But, if indeed, the Development is for 29 turbines then MyG need to submit a revised application.
- 1.2 From the same financial viability evidence I would also call into question MyG's claim of a net capacity factor for the wind farm of between 33.3% and 37.8%, compared to a Welsh average of 25.4%. The long-defunct anemometer mast that MyG's figures are based upon was sited right at the leading edge of the escarpment. Wind speeds at this location, with a prevailing wind direction from a south westerly direction, might be expected to be high. Further back on the plateau, where the majority of the turbines are to be sited, I believe the landform's effect on wind flow will markedly reduce wind speeds, and as a consequence, resulting performance figures.
- 2.1 Can I also use this opportunity to comment on the new visualisations supplied by MyG which I, and others, recently asked for. I again call into question the photomontage techniques used by MyG. For instance looking at the new photomontages from Viewpoint 1, Pumlumon Fawr, Fig 8.11(a1) TS1 and TS2 technicians have rightly used the same base photographs for the two montages. The lighting, however, for the two images is very different making comparison difficult.

2.2 Despite the above criticism, both the wire diagrams and the photomontages, I consider, show that the larger diameter rotors produce a more cluttered complex across the landscape. In my opinion MyG, from the start, should have shown all the rotor/tower permutations that they were considering for the site.

I hope that my comment in section 1.1 of this email is of use as you draw up your dDCO. I also ask that you consider my comments 1.2 through to 2.2 if you ask for any further information for deadline VIII of the examination.

Yours faithfully



Mr. Peter Foulkes, Reg ID no. 10029824