

North Wales Wind Farms connection examination

Written representation submitted for the deadline of [1st September 2015](#).

Interested party [10031169](#).

1. Landcape

- a. The landscapes involved have very significant national and international value and are staggeringly beautiful.
 - i. The rural landscape will become industrialised, there will be immense damage during construction and given that we are some time away from energy storage, wind power will always require back up, how can it be justified to allow this development here?
 - ii. The impact on visual tranquility will be immense in such areas of outstanding natural beauty - North Wales is famous for its wild spaces and magnificent iconic landscapes.

2. Grid connection

- a. The Wind Farms have been granted planning permission without approved grid connections. The cumulative effect of these in combination with the grid connection should make it imperative for Wind Farms and their grid connections to clear planning simultaneously - or not at all.
 - i. With no definitive grid connection confirmed, how can it be possible to accurately establish cumulative and in combination effects of all these projects in respect of habitat, noise and infrastructure?
 1. For example, the proposed Clocaenog Wind Farm had two connection possibilities raised during the inquiry. At that time Natural Resources Wales (NRW) stated that there could be a small risk of in-combination effects and Inspector Mrs. Wendy Burden's attention was drawn to the precautionary principle.
- b. It cannot be right to grant permission for wind farms without agreed connections. In my opinion, when this happens, the integrity of a connection application inquiry must surely be called into question. It would be naive to expect a connection application to be refused if there are Wind Farms waiting to be built.

3. National Resources Wales

- a. NRW will be jointly responsible for habitat protection and also

benefit from the development. NRW state in their relevant representation (5 June 2015 – Point 11.1 “Land Interest”) that they are responsible for both.

- i. How can there be no conflict of interest with one Board and one Chief Executive?

4. Summary

- a. I believe that under grounding of this project would be the least worst option. However, for all of the above reasons it should be refused development consent.

Sheila Harman
30 August 2015