

**From:** [RC](#)  
**To:** [NDE](#)  
**Subject:** Submission concerning renewable energy.  
**Date:** 12 November 2019 16:41:04

---

NDF Team,

Planning Policy Branch,  
Welsh Government,  
Cathays Park,  
Cardiff.  
CF10 3NQ

Dear NDF Team Member,

I am very concerned about global warming, so welcome **efficient** renewable energy in the right place. I am astonished that you anticipate “widespread acceptance” of wind farms all over hills that deserve AONB status and the protection it brings because the local economy relies so heavily on tourism. A tiny vocal minority approve of wind farms, but this acceptance will **\*Never\*** be widespread! Remember the 2014 Public Inquiry? I recall impassioned public meetings with not one voice in favour of onshore wind!

Both the Inspector and Amber Rudd, Minister at that time, wisely listened to majority public opinion and ruled **\*against\*** these wind farms and the pylons necessary to link them to the grid! In the mere five years since then, alarm about global warming has grown, but how can you imagine that people who have demonstrated such opposition to wind turbines and pylons will suddenly accept them, instead of realising their many drawbacks and longing for more efficient renewables instead? Does “widespread acceptance” mean merely dumb resignation as you plough ahead, ignoring feelings that can't have changed significantly since 2014?

I was also deeply dissatisfied with the contradictory answer I received when I stated some of my concerns at a meeting in Newtown Public Library. You may even imagine that I accept your ideas. There wasn't

time for me to explain my reaction, so please let me do so now. Though technology improves, I'd explained that underlying science stays unchanged. The response was that: "the Welsh Government will be building these wind farms but they would bear my points in mind..." Bear my points in mind indeed? You could choose turbines that don't increase pollution elsewhere by including neodymium, yet otherwise – if you go ahead – **\*how can you possibly bear in mind\*** the scientific points I raised?

If you erect wind farms on the hills, are you bearing in mind that –

Nobel Laureate Jack Steinberger, who studies renewable energy, pointed out that "wind represents an illusory technology — a cul-de-sac that will prove uneconomic and a waste of resources in the battle against climate change?" Who can fault the impartial knowledge of a Nobel Laureate? Have you been listening instead to seductively worded industry spin?

If you go ahead... how can you bear in mind that –

North Powys is not windy, and a 10 mph wind only has 1.56% of the power of a 40 mph wind – how can you increase this?

Hard standing around the headwaters of rivers increases flooding downstream?

Tourism is North Powys' main source of income? (Surveys normally "discover" whatever the commissioning body hopes they will find, so surveys claiming that tourists don't object to huge structures that would not be tolerated in the Cotswolds or the Malverns are not to be trusted.)

For turbines to reach hilltops, many miles of hedgerow and mature trees must be destroyed – in areas worthy of AONB status!

1. This repels tourists by further trashing landscapes, and producing traffic jams on main roads. (There is plenty of evidence that green nature is important for good mental health.)
2. The trees and hedgerow shrubs are absorbing carbon dioxide, until they are destroyed and release it. Global warming is set to reach a peak where it becomes irreversible in far less time than it takes replacement trees to grow.
3. This destruction wrecks habitat vital to wildlife survival if we wish to check the ongoing drop in the bird population. (Are you bearing

in mind that this is a massive 40 million since the 1960s!) Naive people say: “the birds will go somewhere else.” A given area of habitat can only produce enough food for a given number of birds and is already occupied by all the birds it can support. Result for birds driven out – death. On a big scale – extinction!

Can you stop turbines from being fatal to both bats and birds?

1. Bats are worth billions to agriculture because of the plant-destroying insects they consume. I provided a link that explains that wind turbines cause the lungs of bats to explode.
2. Birds have evolved to feel safer perching as high as possible and to have eyes on the sides of their heads for looking sideways and downwards rather than straight ahead. So they are first attracted to perch on stationary turbines but then don't see moving ones crashing down on them from above. Can you change this?

Can you prevent the peat bogs where turbines are sited from discharging all their stored CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere?

As for optimistic claims by the industry that the turbines can soon compensate for this extra CO<sub>2</sub>, are you bearing in mind that it's wise to take pro-wind turbine “science” with a large pinch of salt? – businesses that stand to profit have been known to hire scientists who invent pseudo-science to overcome objections to controversial ideas. They have, for example, been brought to book by the Advertising Standards Authority for making claims based on the idea that winds normally blow at the right speed.

A recent review stated that Wales already has enough onshore wind farms. Why ignore it?

I quote our AM, Russell George –

1. "The Mid Wales landscapes should be protected and that an acceptance of landscape change as set out in the proposals is entirely unacceptable.
2. Our rural economy supports thousands of businesses and jobs that are dependent on the scenic Mid Wales landscapes.
3. *In England, local councils are able to determine wind energy applications, and applications must have the backing of local*

*communities to be approved. It is unacceptable that applications in Wales are determined through a decision by Welsh Government Ministers and not local authorities.*

4. *The proposals in the document make insufficient reference to how energy produced by potential large scale wind developments will be connected to the National Grid.*
5. There is insufficient road and highway access across North Powys to facilitate large scale wind development and associated infrastructure.”

He is 100% right! I've italicised points 3 and 4 because I haven't already mentioned them.

Re point 3 – are you bearing in mind that inhabitants of industrial South Wales, who may not visit Mid Wales as tourists, vastly outnumber the inhabitants of the green hills – so as a minority we are overlooked! It sounds democratic but is it fair? These plans make a **\*Lot\*** more difference to “Nimbys” whose livelihoods are threatened!

Re point 4 – Mid-Wales has already seen off plans for pylons. Are we to be faced by a second round of devastation and landscape destruction at a later date?

So are you bearing in mind the potential of Wales for tidal power? (I believe that plans for the Swansea Bay Tidal Lagoon are about to be resurrected.) If you avoid estuaries and do your best to avoid serious disruption to marine wildlife, the scope is tremendous! Yet if you plough so much of your funds into onshore wind, you'll never have enough for technology that really delivers the goods!

In 2014 it cost £1 million to decommission one wind turbine. If you force, for example, a hundred turbines on us, when you finally realise their unpopularity and ineffectiveness, you will (at 2014 rates!) need £100 million to dispose of them. Where are you going to find that much money? What else will suffer as a result?

And if I'm a Nimby, then the whole of England and Wales is a very big back yard! I could continue at length – as you can tell, there really wasn't enough time for this response towards the end of a half-hour slot.

I'd like to add two points about solar energy I didn't mention in Newtown Library because of pressure of time.

1. Similar objections to trashing the landscape apply to large expanses of solar panels; however these look acceptable scattered in smaller numbers. (I moved to the countryside to escape environmental depression caused by living in an ugly town, yet there's a solar panel in full view on the hill in front of my house. If it was a wind turbine or a large cluster of solar panels it would bother me, but one solar panel makes next to no difference. If it was a small cluster I believe I'd feel the same.)
2. Jack Steinberger believes thermal solar is the way forward. I stick to what I've said about not disputing his knowledge of science, but is he also an ornithologist? Probably not. We need to remember that if these are not protected in some way, birds trying to feed on the large numbers of insects attracted to them are roasted alive.

If you bear Mr Steinberger's wisdom in mind, it's simple. You will **\*Not\*** industrialise the hills in vain with yet more great white idols erected to deceive the gullible that we are doing something sensible about global warming. For much of the time these idols are indeed idle – there are thousands, maybe millions, of them worldwide – if they are so efficient, why is global warming getting worse, not better? You will do your best in the fight against global warming by investing in more productive renewables.

If you are determined to ignore Jack Steinberger, and must have wind farms regardless, then please, **\*please\***, site them off-shore where you will get far more wind and far fewer objections!

Otherwise – does this consultation have real value in taking note of widespread feelings against proposals that fill us with horror, or is it a mere political exercise so you can claim afterwards that most people are content?

Thank you very much for reading this submission and this time genuinely taking note!

Best regards,

Rosemary Hart (formerly Cooper),

