

From: Dewi Parry [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 January 2016 11:53
To: North Wales Wind Farm Connection
Subject: Deadline 11 submission

Interested Party Ref: NWWFC-AFP012

Dear Examining Authority,

I would be grateful if you will accept my following comments on the issue of the 30 year time limitation and its association with mitigating the impact of the scheme on sensitive sites.

I am disappointed that the idea of using the time limitation as a mitigating factor in the impact on sites along the proposed route has been introduced.

My family have farmed this area for generations and have always been careful and responsible guardians of the land for the generations to come. My father was a fine example of a farmer who loved the land and abided by organic principles long before the term was coined. I and many many others in this part of north Wales also feel the same duty to protect this precious heritage.

My understanding from comments made is that a time limitation in theory may be used as mitigation for the long term impact of the scheme, however a 30 year period is effectively still a permanent feature for our lifetime. I strongly urge you not to use a time limit as visual impact mitigation and ask you to consider that the impact existing from day 1 is what will affect our generation.

CADW have noted concerns regarding harm to Berain and possibly Eriviat. Their views on what a time limitation would offer are not known, but could well be the same as now. Conwy Council have also voiced similar concerns on Berain and noted that a 30 year time limitation should be considered regardless; they do not suggest that a 30 year limitation would mitigate the impact at all.

We also know that the installation will all too easily come to stay in place longer than 30 years. Its continuation beyond the limit period, despite conditions imposed is more likely than not.

The ExA note that the time constraint would enable the applicant to make the argument of cost of undergrounding to be reconsidered in 30 years, if the need was still there. If the issue is indeed one of cost differentials one could suggest that bearing the cost of undergrounding now is preferable as in 30 years time the cost would also have to include decommissioning the overhead line before installing an underground cable.

I can understand the challenge the ExA has in trying to weigh up the impact of the scheme with the public need or benefit of a connection to a renewable energy source in the context of national policy. However I make the observation that the declared need is predicated on it being an overhead line as that is what the ExA are asked to examine. I strongly urge the

ExA to emphasise in recommendations that the underground alternative is a clear solution that solves all visual impact issues and that the cost differential has been shown to be far less than initially declared.

The cost of undergrounding may well be cheaper in 30 years, but then again it may not, especially if overhead lines continue to be allowed too freely. Could the ExA also consider the possibility that undergrounding may still not be cheaper in the future.

For the cost of undergrounding to become cheaper in the future on the basis of it being more widely used there surely has to be a drive in that direction through positive recommendations by planning authorities.

I sincerely hope that you will give consideration to these points and I appreciate the opportunity you have given me during the examination to make my written and oral representations and for listening and responding thoughtfully. It is the only recourse we have to try to convey the effect this scheme will have on our lives.

Yours sincerely,

Dewi Parry

Interested Party Ref: NWWFC-AFP012