

Re: Planning Application DNS/00427

Dear Mr Bowen,

Following an application made to extend the already extensive Clwadd-du Solar Farm at Tycroes, I wish to register our objection.

The basis of my complaint stems from the comments made in application of the site being “naturally well concealed”. My first question is, from which location was this considered to be “naturally well concealed”? Clearly not from our property, as we can see this site in all its glory! Additionally, there was obviously no consideration made for properties at our location when the ‘landscape and visual’ nor the ‘glint and glare’ assessments were carried out, otherwise it would not be considered a viable application, as we are impacted by both.

Having not been consulted or considered during the initial application, planning and construction of the original installation, we feel strongly about this already monstrous development being extended further. In addition to the original Clwadd-du development, there have already been a further two solar farms erected in close proximity. Our property overlooks this area, and it’s certainly not in keeping with the natural and rural surroundings. To lose agricultural farms and to watch our original view of green fields being transformed into a sea of glass is incredibly sad and truly distressing, considerably affecting our well being.

Furthermore, we have also had, even more, wind turbines installed behind our property, which emit a considerable amount of noise. We fully understand the need for climate control and, as a family, we do all we possibly can to help. However, we feel we have already endured enough and made sufficient personal sacrifice in the name of sustainable energy regeneration, in our particular location. All these developments will also, no doubt, have a negative impact on the value of our property, for which we have worked hard to achieve – who will compensate us for that?

The second question we have is, I wonder if Mr Phill Owen, who is quoted in the South Wales Guardian on 23rd September 2020 as saying “looking at glass instead of grass as we pass, is a small price to pay”, would hold the same view if it was what he was looking at 24 hours a day, every day? Having to keep his curtains closed on a sunny day to deflect the substantial glare, or having a ‘floodlight’ area in front of him, at times, when the moon is full. I very much doubt it.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate our very strong objection to this application on the basis of fairness and equity, or more accurately, unfairness and inequity. Enough is enough!

Your acknowledgement would be appreciated and we look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully