

# Poole and Christchurch Bays' Association

Freepost  
Navitus Bay Wind Park

28 March 2013

Dear Sirs

## **OBJECTION**

### **Proposed Navitus Bay Wind Park - Phase Three Community Consultation Representations from the Association**

#### **Background**

The Association (PCBA) has been formed to complement the work of around 40 existing residents' associations (RAs) in an arc of impact for this proposal around the bays from Purbeck to Christchurch. We expect other RAs to join us as our work gathers momentum; we maintain a working relationship with Challenge Navitus, local Councils and MPs. PCBA is currently a single issue body; its role is to object to the proposed wind park. Details of some of the main objections are given below.

We are aware that a number of major meetings have been held thus far, eg. Hengistbury, Highcliffe and elsewhere and the overwhelming mood has been against constructing such a park (or, more accurately an industrial seascape of aero-generators) in the location proposed. Similar feelings prevailed at a public meeting convened by councillors recently in Bournemouth and reported in the media.

#### **Objections to the Proposal**

As a general point, we have concerns with the quality of the NBDL consultation media, inter alia, unrepresentative photomontages and inaccurate drawings eg. turbine options. We have also been disappointed with the quality and completeness of answers to specific questions asked at the exhibitions and in correspondence. This is leading to a lack of trust in NBDL to give a true and complete view of its plans to the public. The whole process appears to be a PR exercise rather than a valid consultation.

The following is a selection of our main objections:

**Visual impact** The proposed site is in probably the most environmentally sensitive and beautiful settings around the whole of the UK's coast. The area is a valuable national asset and this colossal intrusion on the landscape would have a huge destructive and permanently visual impact. The wind farm would be overlooked by two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and England's sole natural World Heritage Site, the UN designation of which may now be at risk.

We do not believe that the photomontages that were displayed during the latest consultation public meetings and on your website gave a true representation of the intrusion of the turbines on the landscape. The Needles and lighthouse are barely

discernible in your photomontages viewed from both Highcliffe and Hengistbury Head, whereas they are quite prominent to the naked eye; one can even make out the red banding of the lighthouse.

In Page 25, Fig13 of the Consultation document, a critical diagram of the three turbine options is rendered useless because the turbine blades are not reproduced to the same scale as the supporting columns, are too small and therefore misleading.

With such distortions one cannot rely on the veracity of your montages/diagrams of the turbines.

The sea views from all parts of the bays from Durlston Head to the Needles, as well as south west coast of the Isle of Wight from the Needles to St Catherine's Point, will be polluted by this massive intrusion.

**Proximity to shore** Placing such a scheme so close to our coastline is in direct conflict with the Government's Offshore Energy Strategic Environmental Assessment (OESEA2) recommendations which state that a minimum of 12 nautical miles is recommended and that in some cases (our Heritage coast for example) a further distance is justified. There could be no clearer need for maximum distance from the shoreline than this extremely environmentally sensitive location. The OESEA2 recommendations are quite clear on the point and should be followed.

**Tourism** The existing superb outlook across the bays is one of the area's unique selling points. Construction of the wind park with an industrial seascape of turbines and oil-rig size sub-stations would result in considerable damage to tourism, the lifeblood of an area such as this, and in turn, the wider local economy. We estimate that even a very slight downturn in tourism as a result of this proposal could lead to well over 100 jobs lost from Bournemouth alone, well beyond the 100 or so new jobs for the whole area mentioned in your plan.

**Noise** You have failed to address either at the public consultations, or at the recent public meeting in Highcliffe, the negative impact on health caused by low frequency and infra sound caused by turbine rotor blades. Recent international research from Australia and Canada refers to a catalogue of complaints associated with proximity to wind turbines which has, in many cases, caused people to abandon their homes.

**Sailing and navigation** A considerable number of our residents and visitors are active members of the yachting community and they are very concerned with the dangers inherent both during the construction of the turbines, associated cable laying and the wind farm in operation. There will be very dangerous and unhealthy competition for the space around the wind park between fast ferries from Poole and Portsmouth, container ships from Southampton, the local fishing fleet and domestic craft all vying for their own water. If you combine this with a tidal cross flow of three knots, frequent local sea fog and the possible degradation of radar and radios communications, you have a recipe for disaster.

**Birds** You have yet to produce in the public domain any of the data obtained by the bird surveys which you commissioned for 2009/2011. You have had more than enough time to let the public see and evaluate what was found. You have simply stated that there was little or no evidence of birds flying through the proposed site.

There is, however, a considerable volume of data collected by local Dorset and

Hampshire bird groups that the wind park would be located in the direct path not only of hundreds of thousands of birds migrating south in autumn and back in spring, but also acting as a lethal obstruction to enormous numbers of sea birds flying from their North Sea colonies to their winter refuges in the Bay of Biscay and the coast of west Africa.

**Available wind** The audience at the recent public meeting in Highcliffe was astonished to learn that you have not measured either the strength or frequency of the wind at the site and that you did not appear currently to have plans to so do.

**In conclusion**

Shortly, we are totally committed to do all we can to convince NBDL that this wind park is not a good idea and to persuade the Planning Inspectorate to refuse to recommend the project to the Secretary of State.

We have a number of questions of significance to put to NBDL and I should be glad if you could suggest members of your team and dates when you could meet members of our team to answer them.

I look forward to receiving confirmation that you have received, logged and taken note of the contents of this letter.

Yours faithfully

Roy Pointer

DBA(Hon), CEng, MICE, FCIWEM (Dip.WEM), CWEM, FIWater

Chair – Poole and Christchurch Bays' Residents Assn. Steering Group

Postal communications may be sent to PCBA c/o 1 Pinetree Drive, 6 Wilderton Road, Poole, Dorset, BH13 6EE

Copy:

Robert Syms MP

Richard Drax MP

Conor Burns MP

Tobias Ellwood MP

Christopher Chope MP

Chief Exec. Dorset County Council

Chief Exec. Bournemouth Borough Council

Chief Exec. Poole Borough Council

Natural England Winchester

RSPB SW Regional Office