

Planning Enquiries

From: Zoe Davies [redacted]@aol.com>
Sent: 15 August 2012 16:50
To: Klein, Debby; Planning Enquiries
Cc: clerkdorstonepc@aol.com
Subject: Response to Mr. Cottam - Planning Application S121643/F

Dear Ms. Klein,

I have today (15.08.12, 1600 hrs) read the copy of Mr. Cottam's response to my Objection on the relevant page of Herefordshire Planning website - and yet a copy of my original Objection, sent by email and received **earlier** by you that same day has not yet appeared on the same webpage. Why not?

Please confirm to me by email that my objection was received by you within the allotted timescale for public consultation, as Mr. Cottam asserts in his response that it was not. Please also confirm whether or not my own response here in reply to Mr. Cottam will be scanned and placed on the Planning Application webpage.

For the record, I would like to say the following in reply to Mr. Cottam's response :

1. With regards to my not being acquainted nor having any connection with the site and more general local area, Mr. Cottam has made several false assumptions. In fact, I was born in Hereford city and raised in a village **directly neighbouring Dorstone village** where I have also spent most of my adult life. I have lived in Newcastle upon Tyne during the last five years only. I am, therefore, very acquainted and connected with the local area. I don't believe I need to disclose my personal qualifications to Mr. Cottam or the Planning Committee in order to be able to raise objections of relevance. It is irrelevant that some of my objections are similar to some that were made prior to mine. In addition, I believe that some earlier objections were not answered satisfactorily in Mr. Cottam's earlier response and I wished to raise them again - and to include many more of my own.

2. The proposed location of the turbine is on a ridge in the Golden Valley itself. Mr Cottam should be well aware of the fact that many smaller valleys surrounding the actual Golden Valley are often included in reference by locals, tourists and institutions such as BT to the Golden Valley. At no point in my objection did I state or suggest that Pentwyn Farm is adjacent to the Black Mountains. However, the Golden Valley (area) certainly is.

3. What 'care has been taken' by Mr Cottam to ensure there will be no visual damage to the Herefordshire Trail and why was this information not made available to the public including on the planning website for full and fair consultation during the allotted timeframe?

4. Under his heading 'Precedents', Mr Cottam refers to his proposal as for a 'single domestic turbine'. If this is the case, the size of the proposed turbine (as being suitable for larger farms according to the manufacturer) is disproportionate to its primary intended purpose. If this is not the case, then why is Mr. Cottam referring to a commercial turbine scheme (excess electricity to be provided to the local grid) as to be a domestic turbine?

5. Regarding my concerns (not 'wild allegations') about dropping tourism in the area as a result of turbine installation and the likely disqualification of the area from its current shortlisted position for environmental designation as a result of the scheme, I could just as easily provide demonstrable evidence of at least the former occurring within the UK following wind turbine/ farm installation as could Mr. Cottam of evidence to the contrary from wind farm presence in the Spanish Pyrenees. Of course, due to the far greater height and geographical area covered by the Spanish Pyrenees, it is very likely that tourism levels across their entire area can much more easily mitigate any localised impact on tourism of local wind turbine/ farm presence than can the Golden Valley area. My concern regarding likely disqualification from environmental designation stands as there is no evidence provided by the applicant and the relevant environmental agencies to suggest that this will not occur.

6. To be clear to Mr. Cottam, I am fully aware of Global Warming and its thus far documented effects and its predicted outcomes, and am not against installations for renewable energy per se. My objections are very clearly against this proposed installation for this particular type of renewable energy generator at this particular location for the reasons I outlined in my original objection. To equate my objection to me ignoring Global Warming effects and the need for renewable energy/ reductions of carbon footprints is simply disingenuous of Mr. Cottam. Surely, it is the right of the local community to discuss and to decide how best their community proceeds with regards to reducing their own carbon footprint - and not a decision to be foisted upon them by a single potential financial beneficiary?

7. In his response, Mr. Cottam states that noise impact evidence for the proposed turbine comes only from the turbine manufacturer and from discussions with other users. The public (and the Planning Committee?) have not

been given the source of any direct, measured noise impact data from the manufacturer or from any other source with regards to noise levels and tone emanating from the proposed turbine when operating at its exact proposed location and height on site. 'Discussions with other users' is **entirely anecdotal**, possibly biased in favour of the main financial beneficiaries of turbine presence, is unrecorded and therefore not available for consultation by the Planning Committee or the public. Both are discriminatory against full and fair public consultation and also against full and fair consideration by the Planning Committee. The fact that Mr. Cottam can distinguish individual noises at night emanating from his nearest neighbouring farm demonstrates that low level noise does indeed carry far in this area.

8. My apologies regarding my misunderstanding the route of proposed underground cable routing. Having looked at the plan a second time I can see I mis-read this aspect of it. However, my objections stand with regards to possible disturbances from any such installations to springs, ecology and geology including the underlying water table and integrity of the hill on site and in the local vicinity, regardless of their route across and down off the hill.

9. The fact that Mr. Cottam has had to explain that large vehicles need to turn further up the C1208 road (at a single-lane to single-lane junction I must add for your attention) in order to enter the driveway at Pentwyn from the C1208 simply demonstrates that his initial photograph was indeed misleading. Was the Planning Committee even aware that all large vehicles associated with this scheme will need to reverse-turn at a junction of the public highway in order to access Pentwyn Farm?

10. Mr. Cottam is not a Geologist. The information he gives in response to my objection regarding local geology is irrelevant. My objection was to the absence of a professional geological survey of the site and, due to its very absence, to any **possible as yet unknown** disturbances to local geology and/or the underlying water table and/ or the integrity of the hill and/ or springs including the one my father has rights of water access to, that **might** occur as a result of any works/ passing traffic associated with this scheme. These were not 'wild allegations' as Mr Cottam states. Nor can my **concerns** be described as unsubstantiated when there is no scientific survey evidence given by the applicant against the possibility that disturbance to the local geology will occur from this scheme.

11. My father (brother of the late previous owner of Pentwyn Farm) owns the adjacent property down the hill which has water rights to the Spring on Pentwyn Farm land mentioned in my objection. I can confirm that the piping from the Spring on Pentwyn land is in fine working order (last tested at its exit on my father's property on 9th August 2012 in my presence when I was visiting). If any part of the piping is 'hanging from a tree' on the grounds of Pentwyn Farm, it has certainly not been moved there with my father's permission or knowledge. My father himself installed said piping from the Spring, through a culvert beneath the existing trackway on the Farm down to what is now my father's property, originally in c1975. I am unsure as to why Mr. Cottam mentions the stream from the Spring as being sufficient for the occasional sheep that graze my father's property. This simply has no relevance to my father's ongoing legal right to access water from the spring (at its source on Pentwyn land directly adjacent to and above the existing trackway), nor indeed to my objections to anything within Mr. Cottam's scheme that might damage/ contaminate the spring/ its waters to which my father has legal access.

12. I made **no claim whatsoever** in my objection that small farms offer no benefit to the community. My point was clearly made that I believe this proposed scheme on this particular site would bring no financial benefit to the community, and that financial benefits to the applicant and his agent would be at the expense of other probable losses to the community. In addition, if Mr. Cottam is insinuating that Pentwyn Farm is a small (and not large) farm, then why does his application include a proposed size of wind turbine suitable for 'larger farms'?


13. If Dr. Knight conducted any of his tests 'overnight' then why was his Survey report only headed with a single date 24.05.2012 and not two dates including the next day (very early morning)? Dr. Knight makes no mention in his report of having surveyed either pond at night for Great Crested Newt. Dr. Knight clearly adjudged at least one pond to be potential habitat for the Great Crested Newt as he surveyed it for Great Crested Newt eggs. I welcome any response he gives to the Planning Committee as to why he did not return to survey the same pond for eggs, larvae and adult Great Crested Newts using a variety of techniques, per industry-wide standards. I also welcome Dr. Knight's response to the Planning Committee regarding why he did not survey the other pond on site and why he did not at all investigate Mr. Cottam's **anecdotal** evidence of amphibious species presence/ absence in the pond not surveyed for Great Crested Newt and the annual drying up of the surveyed pond. Mr. Cottam's own descriptions of the two ponds and their biodiversity are **irrelevant** to the inclusions and findings of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey as the Survey was conducted and signed off by Dr. Knight in his own professional capacity. I also welcome Dr. Knight's response to my other objections regarding the findings and presentation of the Survey.

14. In his response, Mr. Cottam again fails to include any source of direct, measured data regarding wind speeds and their consistency at the exact proposed location of the turbine hub above ground at Pentwyn Farm. My original point was that this exclusion was discriminatory against full and fair public consultation for this scheme which is entirely based on a claim from the applicant that Pentwyn Farm has 'an excellent wind resource'. How do we, the public, and the Planning Committee actually know this to be the case if the data supporting this claim has not yet been made available for us to see? I also refer the applicant and Committee to the weaknesses I outlined regarding the NOABL wind map database referenced as the applicant's data source in his application, namely that this is modelled and

estimated only and takes no account of local topography.

15. Pentwyn Farm is not a dairy farm. My original point was that the proposed wind turbine size is disproportionate to a farm that has no farming activities that use electricity, as is the case at Pentwyn. It is a complete unknown (due to lack of measured wind data on site over seasonal time) as to whether the turbine will operate at a level and for long enough periods to be able to supply electricity to the local grid and be of any benefit, financial or otherwise, to the local community.

Sincerely,

Zoe Davies
11, Lowick Court
South Gosforth
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE3 1YQ
@com

15.08.12