

12 September 2011

Committee Clerk
Environment & Sustainability Committee
National Assembly for Wales
Cardiff Bay, CF99 1NA

Dear Chairman,

Energy Consultations.

I wish to bring the following points to the attention of the committee. If the committee wishes it, all of these observations will be substantiated with researched numbers.

1. The E&SD department in a letter to me dated 07 Sept 2011 states that the overall target is 1,700 MW of installed wind power capacity.
2. This amount of wind power capacity, operating at the currently proven achievable load factor of $\leq 25\%$ = 425MW at most.
3. This amount of power capacity, irrespective of its unpredictable delivery schedule, amounts in one year to $425 \times 8760 = 3.7$ TWh in total.
4. Employing windmills and assuming an average of 2.3MW power per windmill **on average**, will require 739 wind turbines each reaching 300-450 skyward.

A Mr Nurton of the above department has informed me that this number is "acceptable". It is not. He writes that it will require "very little" back up capacity. He does not state how much – his entire four page letter is all-but bereft of verifiable numbers. This is a numbers issue. He asserts that the planet's climate "must" be stopped from changing. The Welsh windpower projects will reduce global CO₂ emissions in the department's view, by an amount which justifies the cost, disruption, collateral environmental damage, and the destruction of the essential nature of Montgomeryshire and other TAN 8 areas resultant from the **cumulative** effects of the wind powered generating stations.

In my view this is trenchant nonsense for, amongst others, the following reasons (time and space preclude their full inclusion) :

1. The global climate cannot be maintained to within temperature parameters of $\pm 2\text{C}$ by normal humans, nor even, however hard to believe, by governments. Further there is no need to make the attempt. **To sacrifice the better parts of Wales on this altar is completely unacceptable.**
2. The ES&D department has so far not specified what level of back up will be required for 1700MW of installed wind capacity. Other scientific assessments indicate that their sanguine view of "small amounts" is unrealistic: very knowledgeable and highly **experienced operators of massive percentages of the European wind grid aver that 80-90% back up is required.** They ought to know.
3. To proceed with this project whilst the level of disagreement between experienced and knowledgeable engineers remains this wide, would be utterly foolish; it is quite clear that the jury is still out, and **the whole project should be at least put on hold until this issue, amongst others is put to rest. TAN 8 is not "fit for purpose" and has to be revisited.**
4. The Royal Society of Engineering, after detailed study of all the data produced its "Generating the Future" document dated March 2010. It was led by one of the most

august assemblages of engineering knowledge and expertise ever assembled for such purpose. Has the W.A.G. properly studied it? Where is WAG's response?

5. The Society (with no "axe to grind") was forced to conclude that once the issue of renewable energy was denuded of sound-bites; hyperbole; industry special-pleading; and governmental double-speak, the **numbers** show that the idea of sustaining growth in GDP, and controlling the climate by "renewables" is utterly outwith the nation's resources. The way to go is by **reduction of consumption NOT increase in production** of electricity.
6. The concept of producing ever increasing amounts of electrical energy from ever reducing energy-dense feed-stocks is so self evidently fatuous that only a person seriously desirous of self delusion could even contemplate it. **To saturate an area with a continuous array of wind turbines from the English border to the Welsh coast – an area whose very economic existence depends on tourism, is lunacy.**
7. There is every reason to believe that the W.A.G. has been seduced into promoting this policy because in the short term it can see cash flowing in from renting out forests which hitherto the populace felt were somehow theirs.

To summarise – this is an issue of scale. Hitherto wind farms were tiny, unobtrusive, not much use but not very noticeable either. The W.A.G. has let loose a feeding frenzy of power companies who, through a devious subsidy system are exercising unacceptable leverage on ministers.

This must stop because it is not in the best interest of ANY of the people, let alone the people initially whose lives will be ruined, by the wind farms, the infrastructure, the transport issues which are huge and on-going, the damage to the uplands and peat bogs etc.

If one wind farm is erected, birds and bats and other protected species can move. If there is nowhere left to move to, they are destroyed. Is this "sustainability"? Is this "environmentalism"? If it is, I want none of it.

Yours faithfully,



Robert J V Trueman