

Chapter 3 - The Proposed Y Bryn Development

Section 3.2 - Project Design - EIA guidance requires the applicant to provide evidence of alternatives e.g. locations, layouts, design such as heights and numbers of turbines. This section states that the design process has taken account of the relationship to the surrounding landscape and communities, cumulative developments and technical and environmental constraints. Evidence of the alternatives considered and the iterative design approach, including landscape considerations should be provided. We note that there is a section on 'Site Selection and Design Evolution' proposed to be included in the ES as outlined in *Table 7.7.1: Proposed ES Structure*.

Chapter 7 - Environmental Statement

We have provided comments on additional matters and their assessments which we advise should be scoped into the ES under the relevant chapters in this letter.

The proposed 'Forestry Assessment' chapter would be better suited under the Physical Environment section as this relates to land use and changes in tree cover.

Chapter 10 – Ecology

General Advice

We consider that the EIA for this development should include sufficient information to determine the extent of any environmental impacts arising from the proposed scheme on legally protected species, including those which may also comprise notified features of designated sites affected by the proposals.

Evaluation of the impacts of the scheme should include direct and indirect; secondary; cumulative; short, medium and long term; permanent and temporary; positive and negative, and construction, operation and decommissioning phase and long-term site security impacts on the nature conservation resource, landscape and public access.

Description of the Project

Within the EIA, the proposed scheme should be described in detail in its entirety. This description should cover construction, operation and decommissioning phases as appropriate and include detailed, scaled maps and drawings as appropriate.

We would expect the description to include:

- The purpose and physical characteristics of the proposals;
- Location, development size and configuration of the development including flexibility of the site layout;
- Procedures for good working practices;
- Identification of appropriate pollution contingency and emergency measures for watercourses on site;

- Timing of all works and contingency plans should slippage in the programme occur;
- Maintenance requirements of structures;
- Maintenance of any habitats within the site;

Illustrations within the Environmental Statement

Any maps, drawings and illustrations that are produced to describe the project should be designed in such a way that they can be overlaid with drawings and illustrations produced for other sections of the ES such as biodiversity.

Description of Biodiversity

The ES must include a description of all the existing natural resources and wildlife interests within and in the vicinity of the proposed development, together with a detailed assessment of the likely impacts and significance of those impacts.

Key Habitats

Any habitat surveys should accord with the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC) Phase 1 survey guidelines (NCC (1990) Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey. NCC, Peterborough). We note that this is referred to in section 10.3.6. We advise that Phase 1 surveys are undertaken and completed during the summer to ensure the best chance of identifying the habitats present. The EIA should specify and quantify any proposed loss of habitats to the scheme including forestry habitats from all aspects of the proposed development including any infrastructure requirements (e.g. road widening) and provide information on mitigatory or compensatory habitat creation if applicable. We advise that you consult with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) with regard to any impacts on habitats falling under Section 7 of the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.

Section 10.4.10 'Woodland and scrub' – We advise this section is inaccurate as the woodland cover does not consist of even-aged stands and the stands are not pre-dominantly Sitka Spruce and Lodgepole Pine. Large scale felling within these forests are a result of the removal of *Phytophthora ramorum* infected larch to comply with Plant Health Regulations. We advise that you contact our Forestry Land Management Team who can provide information on the baseline forestry habitats. The NRW contact is Philip Morgan, Land Management Team Leader who is contactable at: Philip.Morgan@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk.

Designated Sites

'Table 10.1: Designated Sites' has omitted the Eglwys Nunydd Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), however we note that this is referenced in Table 11. 6 within Chapter 11 - Ornithology. Migrant and resident wetland bird populations are a feature of this SSSI, which may use the site to access the reservoir and therefore the site should be screened in regarding any potential impacts on them. We note that the remaining sites listed in Table 10.1 will be scoped out of the EIA.

Protected Species

Sites Surveys

We advise the site is subject to assessment to determine the likelihood of protected species being present in the area and likely to be affected by the proposals. Targeted species surveys should be undertaken for all species scoped in and:

- i. Be undertaken by qualified, experienced and where necessary, licensed ecologist; and
- ii. Comply with current best practice guidelines. In the event that the surveys deviate from published guidance, or there are good reasons for deviation, full justification for this should be included within the EIA.

We note and welcome that bats, great crested newts, dormice, otters and water voles are scoped into the EIA. We provide additional comments on some of these species below.

Bats

We advise that any bat surveys are carried out in accordance with the following guidance: [Bats and onshore wind turbines: Survey, Assessment and Mitigation, Jan 2019](#)

We welcome that surveys will be done at height using a static detector attached to a met mast and we would welcome clarification of the height that these will achieve, and whether the met masts will be located in areas of open habitat and/or above forested areas.

Great Crested Newts

It's unclear from the wording within the SR whether eDNA of ponds would only be undertaken on those six ponds classified as 'below average', 'average' or 'good' using HSI methodology, or if eDNA would be undertaken of all nine ponds. NRW advises that an assigned HSI classification of 'poor' should not, on its own, justify restricting application of the survey method to ponds with a better classification. There may be other reasons justifying the approach to the application of the eDNA survey methodology and, if so, these should be documented in the ES.

Water Voles

We advise that surveys for water voles are undertaken in the period mid-April to end of June, and July to September with at least 2 months apart between visits. A second visit may not be needed where the effects on water voles can be made on a precautionary basis based on the observations of the first visit.

Impact Assessment

Should protected species be found during the surveys, information must be provided identifying the species specific impacts in the short, medium and long term together with any mitigation and compensation measures proposed to offset the impacts identified.

Where proposals concern protected species, which are also notified features of designated sites (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)), we advise that the EIA considers the impacts on those species from both perspectives.

We advise that the EIA sets out how the long term site security of any mitigation or compensation will be assured, including management and monitoring information and long term financial and management responsibility. Where the potential for significant impacts on protected species is identified, we advocate that a Conservation Plan is prepared for the relevant species and included as an Annex to the EIA.

European Protected Species (EPS) Licence

Where a European Protected Species is identified and the development proposal will contravene the legal protection they are afforded, a licence should be sought from NRW. The EIA must include consideration of the requirements for a licence and set out how the works will satisfy the three requirements as set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). One of these requires that the development authorised will 'not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range'. These requirements are also translated into planning policy through Planning Policy Wales (PPW) December 2018, section 6.4.22 and 6.4.23 and Technical Advice Note (TAN) 5, Nature Conservation and Planning (September 2009).

Local Biodiversity Interests

We recommend that the developer consults the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) Ecologist on the scope of the work to ensure that regional and local biodiversity issues are adequately considered, particularly those habitats and species listed in the relevant Local Biodiversity Action Plan, and those that are considered important for the conservation of biological diversity in Wales. For example, we note that as detailed in section 10.7.4, common herpetile species are proposed to be scoped out of the EIA, with a working method statement proposed. This section however acknowledges that they are highly likely to be present and in the absence of specialised survey work, it is unclear if the site is important in a local/regional context (upland areas are often under recorded) and what the impact of the development on these species will be. Additionally, there are also areas of very rich bryophyte assemblages on the Welsh Government Woodland Estate in this area, both on the ground and arboreal, such as hypo-oceanic species, e.g. Irish daltonia, as well as some species-rich native forest ground layers beneath Larch and Pine plantations. We therefore advise consultation with the LPA's Ecologist to agree on whether they should be scoped in and if so, the assessments and information required to be provided in the EIA.

NRW would expect the developer to contact other relevant people/organisations for biological information/records relevant to the site and its surroundings. These include the relevant Local Records Centre and any local ecological interest groups (e.g. bat groups, mammal groups).

Question(Q)5: Do consultees agree with the approach used for scoping in/out statutory and non-statutory designated sites?

Please see our comments above.

Q6: Do consultees consider the proposed baseline survey methodologies appropriate?

Please see our comments above.

Q7: Do consultees see value to any particular mitigation and/or enhancement measures for any local or regional species or habitats, whether referred to above or otherwise?

Please see our comments above. We will comment on mitigation measures once the survey work is complete and the impacts/receptors have been fully identified and assessed.

Chapter 11 – Ornithology

Q8: Are consultees satisfied with the coverage provided by the vantage point locations?

We have concerns regarding the relatively large proportion of the site that is currently not covered by the vantage point (VP) surveys as shown on Figure 11.1. The EIA will need to address this by explaining the reasoning over lack of coverage, provide justification or compensate for the restrictions in the coverage. For example, a correction factor could be applied using data from similar habitat covered to be used as a proxy, however this needs to be acknowledged as a constraint.

Q9: Are consultees satisfied with the ornithology surveys proposed for a second year of baseline recording (i.e. a full year of VP surveys at standard effort (36hrs per season: September to February and March to August), raptor surveys (February to August) nightjar surveys (June and July) and with no repeat of the breeding bird survey)?

Although the duration of survey at many of the VPs falls short of the recommended guidance (33 hours rather than 36 hours), we understand that 2020 has been a challenging year and agree, given the circumstances, it is sufficient. Please however refer to our comments above to Q8. We advise however that the shortfall is addressed, e.g. by applying a correction factor for the Collision Risk Modelling. A second year of breeding bird survey is required to be carried out to capture inter-annual variation. Additionally, we note that year 1 of breeding bird surveys commenced in May, missing an earlier part of the season and possibly early breeding activity by some species e.g. waders. A second year of breeding bird surveys should therefore commence from the end of March, following best practice guidelines with an even spread of surveys throughout the season.

Q10: Do consultees agree with those ornithological features that have been highlighted for assessment within EIA and those that have been 'scoped out'?

We will wait for the results of both years' surveys before coming to a conclusion on this.

Q11: Are there any other key ornithological features that consultees believe should be considered that have not been discussed above?

Target species list should also draw on Section 7 species (under the Environment Act (Wales) 2016) and species listed on the Amber list for Birds of Conservation Concern (BoCC).

Q12: Do consultees consider any Natura 2000 not discussed above as requiring consideration as part of screening for AA?

All relevant Special Protection Areas (SPAs) appear to have been identified based on the search criteria.

Q13: Do consultees see value to any particular mitigation and/or enhancement measures for any local or regional species, whether referred to above or otherwise?

We will comment on mitigation measures once the survey work is complete and the impacts/receptors have been fully identified and assessed.

Chapter 12 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)

Our advice on this chapter relates to the potential impacts on the Gower Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Brecon Beacons National Park (BBNP).

LANDMAP

Section 12.2 'Guidance' and 12.3.5 refers to LANDMAP Guidance Note 3. Please note that this guidance has recently been updated under 'Using LANDMAP in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments GN46' which is available on NRW's website at: [Natural Resources Wales / Using LANDMAP in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments GN46](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk/using-landmap-in-landscape-and-visual-impact-assessments-gn46).

Reference should be made to the respective Management Plans of the Gower AONB and Brecon Beacons National Park including their special qualities, when assessing impacts on these landscapes.

Additionally, a seascape assessment should be included in the EIA as the proposal could impact on the seascape to the south. A local seascape character assessment has been produced for Carmarthen Bay, Gower and Swansea Bay which may aid your assessment. This is available at: [Swansea - Carmarthen Bay, Gower & Swansea Bay Local Seascape Character Assessment](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk/swansea-carmarthen-bay-gower-swansea-bay-local-seascape-character-assessment).

Section 12.3.2 - We advise that changes to landscape character and the way the landscape is experienced also includes the scenic qualities of views from a landscape at a distance from a development and impacts on perceptual qualities such as tranquillity, wildness and remoteness.

Section 12.3.6 - Cadw and the Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trusts (GGAT) should be consulted with regard to Historic Landscapes on the Register of Historic Landscapes in Wales, of which there are several in the Study Area.

Section 12.3.17 - We note that aviation lighting will be required for turbines of this scale, as confirmed in section 20.2.12. Night-time photographs/photomontages would therefore be required in this case and acknowledge that section 12.4.13 states that key night-time visualisations would be produced.

Section 12.4.10 – The Melincourt windfarm, Resolven, which was approved in 2014 under Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council planning reference P2014/0883 should also be included in *Table 12.8: Cumulative Wind Farms*.

Q14: Do consultees agree that assessing the maximum hub height available for the tip height in question is appropriate?

We suggest that the combination of maximum blade tip and hub height need to be assessed for the worst case scenario. It is the overall scale of the turbines, including the height and swept area of the blades and scale of hub/column that affects visual impact. The maximum size of turbine potentially to be used should be assessed.

Q15: Do you agree with the proposed size of the study area?

The proposed study area is considered acceptable.

Q16: Do consultees agree with the number, location and receptor types that have been selected as the representative viewpoints in order to assess the effects on visual amenity within the study area?

We advise that a photograph, wireline and photomontage from viewpoints in the Gower AONB and BBNP should be included in the assessment, given the scale of the development and sensitivities of these areas. We suggest an additional viewpoint from the Y Mynydd Du area of the BBNP to cover potential impacts on this part of the area.

Q17: Do consultees agree with the methodology used to determine which wind farms are to be included within the cumulative assessment and also agree with the list provided in Table 12.8?

We consider the methodology generally sound, subject to the above comments. Section 12.4.13 states that the intention is to produce photomontages from only 10 viewpoints. This seems a small number considering the scale of development and likely to require reconsideration following stakeholder comments.

Q18: Do the consultees agree with the proposed approach to assess the effects on landscape character and visual amenity?

We note the proposals under section 12.4.14 and advise that changes to forestry as shown on the Forest Design Plans need to be presented on drawings overlaid with the wind farm proposals and forestry proposals associated with the development, as well as being described, to allow a detailed picture to be analysed. It may be that annotated photographs would be required in some instances.

Q19: Do consultees see value to any particular enhancement measures?

There would potentially be value in landscape enhancement measures on the site itself and immediate locality and these should be considered.

Chapter 13 - Hydrology, Geology and Hydrogeology

Water Resources

Activities related to wind turbine construction such as foundations and borrow pits can result in risks to groundwater and surface water from instances such as pollution/turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination and physically disturbing aquifers. It should therefore be ensured that any works will not result in contamination or affect water resources. We advise that firstly a water feature survey should be carried out which identifies all water features which could be affected by the proposed operations.

The developer should therefore undertake a preliminary site assessment for a water feature surveys which should include the following:

- Identification of all water features both surface and groundwater (ponds, springs, ditches, culverts etc.) within a 300 metres radius of the site;
- Use made of any of these water features. This should include the construction details of wells and boreholes and details of the lithology into which they are installed;
- An indication of the flow regime in the spring or surface water feature, for example whether or not the water feature flows throughout the year or dries up during summer months;
- Accessibility to the spring/well;
- This information should be identified on a suitably scaled map (i.e. 1:10,000), tabulated and submitted to Natural Resources Wales. It would be useful for the developer to photograph each of the identified water features during the survey.

Based on the results of the survey the applicant must assess the likely impacts from the development on both quantity and quality of the surface water and groundwater. This should take into consideration both the preferred methods of construction and the assumed hydrogeology in the vicinity of the development.

We may require identified groundwater features to be monitored during the proposed workings. We would therefore recommend that the survey be undertaken as soon as possible to enable the developer to carry out suitable baseline monitoring prior to the commencement of any workings at the site.

These water features should be assessed to identify any mitigation measures required to prevent pollution and to safeguard water resources. Further advice on pollution prevention is provided below.

Dewatering of excavations (i.e. borrow pits) may lower groundwater levels locally and may derogate nearby domestic and licensed groundwater sources. Certain private and small water supplies do not require a licence; therefore, we are not necessarily aware of their existence. The locations of private domestic sources are held by the local authority and the details presented in the water feature survey.

If dewatering is proposed as part of these works an abstraction licence from NRW may be required. The granting of planning permission does not guarantee an abstraction licence under the Water Resources Act 1991. A permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 may be required if the works involve the use of drilling fluids, foams or grouts.

Pollution Prevention Measures

We welcome that a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be produced, as outlined in section 13.5.13. The plan should be produced to address pollution prevention and control measures, to be deployed across the whole project area. The CEMP should include:

- Construction methods: details of materials, how waste generated will be managed; to include all infrastructure including turbine foundations, crane hardstandings; construction laydown areas; mineral borrow pits to include location, volume of rock to be removed from each location, reinstatement plan; construction of electrical substation and battery storage
- General Site Management: details of the construction programme including timetable, details of site clearance; details of site construction drainage, containments areas, appropriately sized buffer zones between storage areas (of spoil, oils, fuels, concrete mixing and washing areas) and any watercourse or surface drain;
- Biodiversity Management: details of tree and hedgerow protection; invasive species management; species and habitats protection, avoidance and mitigation measures (Please note that depending on the results of the ecological survey work, this information may need to be provided in a separate standalone document).
- Soil Management: details of topsoil strip, storage and amelioration for re-use.
- De-watering of excavations (further advice on dewatering provided above)
- Culverting and headwall details including improvements/upgrading; to include material types and backfill;

- An assessment of the location of buried cables on the site to assess the accessibility of the forest. Where restrictions are limited, crossing points (concrete slab) should be constructed to allow access.
- CEMP Masterplan: details of the extent and phasing of development; location of landscape and environmental resources; design proposals and objectives for integration and mitigation measures.
- Control of Nuisances: details of restrictions to be applied during construction including timing, duration and frequency of works; details of measures to minimise noise and vibration from piling activities, for example acoustic barriers; details of dust control measures; measures to control light spill and the conservation of dark skies.
- Resource Management: details of waste generation and its management; details of water consumption, wastewater and energy use; procedure for handling and producing cement based products such as concrete and grout, storage and use of polluting substances such as fuels, oils and chemicals, soil and peat storage methods to include soil handling methods during site restoration;
- Traffic Management: details of site deliveries, plant on site, wheel wash facilities
- Pollution Prevention: demonstrate how relevant Guidelines for Pollution Prevention and best practice will be implemented, including details of emergency spill procedures and incident response plan.
- Details of the persons and bodies responsible for activities associated with the CEMP and emergency contact details.

We encourage the developer to commit a dedicated resource to the installation and ongoing maintenance of the pollution prevention mitigation deployed across the development. For example, the measures deployed along the access tracks should be inspected daily, the effectiveness of water treatment methods should also be subject to regular review. Furthermore, the frequency of inspection and maintenance should be increased during and following periods of rain. In our experience the type of stone used to surface the access tracks is critical; mudstone and gritstone tend to breakdown easily and produce a slurry which places additional pressures on the surface water drainage treatment system. We would expect that the pollution prevention measures would be deployed in advance of the commencement of construction activities with deployment along: access tracks, construction compound and around turbine locations being prioritised to safeguard watercourses.

The use of articulated dump trucks (ADT) on access tracks has proven to be extremely destructive to road surface quality which has resulted in server pressure being borne on the road surface water drainage and treatment system. Due to the pressures which ADT's exert on such road systems, we encourage alternative and less damaging means of transportation to be used. Furthermore, we advise the access tracks are not used during certain weather conditions, such as during prolonged or intensive periods of rainfall.

A soil management plan should be produced in conjunction with a peat management plan (peat is further discussed below). We would expect phased soil stripping to be undertaken during construction, together with the adoption of soil conservation and storage techniques in accordance with best practice guidance (Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, DEFRA).

Table 13.2: Baseline Information Sources - NRW has not been cited as a source of information for potential abstractors in the development area and wider hydrologically linked catchments. The applicant should seek to obtain relevant information from NRW so that a full assessment can be undertaken.

Section 13.4.13 - Construction activities such as access track widening, reinforcement of culverts over watercourses, reducing the severity of track bends by increasing the length and width of the existing track, reducing gradients of certain sections of track are all likely to be required in order to facilitate the transportation of the turbine components to their chosen locations. The developer should consider the adoption of a one-way traffic management system during the construction phase of the development which may help reduce the physical impact which the above activities may have on the water environment.

Fish habitat improvements should be incorporated into the designs for the reinforcement of existing access track culverts or any new culverts proposed. NRW can assist with assessing the feasibility of the requirements and provide technical fisheries advice on the mitigation measures required at the design phase.

Infrastructure assessment should also include cable routes as excavating long sections of cable trenches without backfilling promptly can create pathways which may enable contaminated run off to enter local watercourses. Such pollution risks may be compounded by the type of aggregate used to surround and protect the cable. The developer should consider installing water stops within the trench sectional design particularly in areas where ground conditions are poor or where steep and long gradients are encountered. We recommend that pollution prevention controls mitigating against the effects of soil erosion be deployed during surface restoration of any cable route required.

Section 13.4.15 – We note the applicant would seek to complement the objectives of the Natural Flood Management pilot project through the infrastructure design of the wind farm. NRW are currently reviewing these pilot projects and pending the outcome, may welcome further engagement in relation to this matter. The NRW point of contact is the NRW Neath Port Talbot Environment Team, who can be contacted on:

13.4.28 'Geology' – Due to the presence of South Wales Middle Coal Measures Formation, with Pennant Sandstone formations in the area, the developer may be likely to encounter historical workings and tips within their work area (for both coal and stone). More information on the coal mining features can be sought from the Coal Authority, though it should be noted that their records are incomplete due to the age of some of the workings in this area (pre-record). The risk posed to controlled waters from historic coal mining activities should therefore be considered.

The whole area is designated as Secondary 2A Aquifer (Minor); this is generally permeable layers capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale, and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers. Within the footprint for the site the Groundwater Vulnerability designation varies, the majority being 'High', though there are some areas of 'Medium'. This may need to be considered when preparing the turbine

base sites, as this often involves undertaking drilling, piling and/or ground stabilisation activities. We advise that this is particularly important where cementitious grouts or additives are proposed to be used.

Section 13.4.33 'Water Resources' – Please note there is a reservoir on site owned by Welsh Water within the Bryn forest block.

Section 13.5.9 - We welcome that a 50m buffer is proposed however we would require clarification on the proposed buffer zone for all unmapped watercourses following the site surveys.

Consideration should also be given to the restocking of areas in line with the approved Forestry Resource Plans which will help to mitigate against the effects of surface water run-off, soil erosion and increases in ground water.

Section 13.5.12 'Drainage' – Please refer to our comments above regarding likely pollution sources. The guidance listed in Table 13.1 is imperative for correct design of any pollution prevention methods and strategies.

Section 13.5.12 'Welfare Facilities' – We assume that the proposals are referring to a septic tank or package treatment plant discharge when referring to "soakaway". If a soakaway or package treatment plant is required for welfare facilities, the applicant may be required to apply for the correct permit to discharge from NRW. Any discharge to ground requires an appropriately designed and built drainage field (not soakaway). Further information is available here: [Natural Resources Wales / Water discharges and septic tanks](#).

Section 13.5.12 'Cement and Concrete' – We note that Pollution Prevention Guide (PPG) 6 'Working at construction and demolition sites' has been highlighted as guidance and best practice to follow in Table 13.1. We advise that Section 7 of this document should be referred to when planning all activities involving cement, concrete and grout. We would welcome further details on how the applicant intends to carefully control the use of wet concrete in and around watercourses, as specified in this section of the SR. The likely volume of cement and concrete required for this development will be considerable. The applicant is encouraged to carefully consider how water will be provided for the production and if any permits are required for this (e.g. abstraction licence for borehole). Further detail on permits can be found on our website at: [Natural Resources Wales / Permits and permissions](#).

Section 13.5.12 'Monitoring Plan' – We require a monitoring/inspection strategy/plan covering watercourses and any discharges from treated surface water areas to local watercourses. This will be especially relevant during rainfall.

Section 13.5.12 'Contingency Plans' - We welcome further dialogue with the applicant with regard to the formulation of this plan. The NRW point of contact is the NRW Neath Port Talbot Environment Team, who can be contacted on:

Section 13.5.12 'Training' - This must include impacts of common pollutants to watercourses.

Water Framework Directive (WFD)

The SR touches upon the Water Framework Directive in Chapters 10 and 13. We advise that due consideration must be given to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and therefore we recommend a section on WFD is incorporated into the EIA. The section on WFD should reference the waterbodies hydrologically linked to the development, their current status (2021 data will be released in the first quarter of 2021), how this development is likely to affect WFD classification and provide appropriate mitigation if required. Further information on WFD classification can be found on our website at: [Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru \(naturalresourceswales.gov.uk\)](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk).

Flood Risk

All watercourses within the site boundary are classified as ordinary watercourses (rather than main rivers) and therefore any culverting/crossings or works to these rivers would be subject to consent from the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority.

Our flood risk map confirms a small section of the Nant Cwmwernderi (stream) is located within flood zone C2 of the Development Advice Map (DAM) contained in Technical Advice Note (TAN)15. Section 13.5.9 states that a 50m buffer will be implemented for all identified mapped hydrological features and infrastructure will be located outside this buffer except where access necessitates. We therefore advise that any works proposed within 8m of the identified floodplain may require a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) from NRW. We will be able to provide further information on this when greater detail of the scheme is provided. Further information on FRAPs is available on our website at: [Natural Resources Wales / Flood risk activity permits](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk).

Land Contamination

The SR does not mention the potential for land contamination from historical uses and whether this will be investigated. Given the location of the site within the South Wales coal fields there is the potential for land contamination and as a minimum a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) should be completed.

We therefore advise the developer:

1. Follows the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination.
2. Refer to the Environment Agency's '[Guiding Principles for Land Contamination](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)' for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health.
3. Refer to the [Environment Agency's \(2018\) 'Approach to Groundwater Protection'](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

Peat

We note the sources of information list provided in *Table 13.2: Baseline Information Sources*, used to carry out the desk based study of this chapter. We advise that the 'Unified peat layer' dataset resource, which was created by NRW and the Welsh Government, is also accessed for baseline information. This data is available by accessing the Lle Portal via NRW's website: [Natural Resources Wales / Maps](https://www.naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

We note the proposals to carry out Phase 1 peat survey, which will be used to inform a more detailed phase 2 peat survey, as outlined in sections 13.4.25 – 13.4.27. In relation to survey methodology, probing to determine peat depth is an acceptable methodology, however this should be calibrated periodically with hand-augering to confirm what feels like peat actually is peat. Locations of depth probing and augering should be recorded using a GPS.

Peat depth data should be presented either as open (i.e. contours only) or closed colour shaded peat depth contour maps (with assessment points marked) or (more usually) as coloured circles indicating specific depth classes according to the suggested scheme below.

Depth range (cm)	Colour codes
0 – 50	Blue or green
> 50 – 100	Yellow
>100 – 150	Orange
> 150 - 300	Red
>300	Purple

The analytical method employed to produce contoured representations of peat depth should be clearly stated, and raw peat depth data provided in an Annex with NGRs to at least 8 but preferably 10 figures (excluding 100 km identifier).

To broadly determine where deep peat occurs on a site, an initial 100m x 100m peat probe grid should be carried out to cover all areas of forestry. If deep peat is encountered, peat probes should be carried out every 20 metres in all directions until deep peat is not encountered (<30cm) to accurately determine the edge of the peat body. Areas of obvious bog and mire viewed on aerial photography that are missed by the grid should be visited and peat depths ascertained, and the extent of the peat body determined as above. Checks should also be made with existing soil maps and the aforementioned unified peat layer to check for omissions especially in areas of forestry where bog vegetation will not alert applicants to the presence of deep peat.

Within peatland habitats, probing will nominally be conducted on a 10m grid. This density may be amended in the field using a case by case professional judgement, where there is little peat present or little variability in the depths. Probing will also seek to explore and define features. NRW require a minimum of 1 peat core per 10 peat probes.

Once an accurate peat map has been produced, infrastructure layouts can then be informed to avoid all areas of deep peat where necessary. The presence of deep peat may require the re-siting or removal of infrastructure if alternative routes avoiding the peat resource

cannot be determined. We note that a Peat Management Plan will be produced, following the survey work. Contingency plans should be made in the plan in the event that greater peat reserves be uncovered during the construction phase than were originally anticipated.

When assessing the appropriateness of any peat depth mapping undertaken in relation to the resource and any impacts, we advise that the EIA needs to demonstrate that impacts on peat have been avoided or minimised through the peat surveys. It is unlikely this can be achieved if measurements are only provided for the immediate vicinity of proposed windfarm infrastructure. For this reason, sufficient peat depth data should be collected to provide an understanding of the overall distribution of peat within the application site.

We advise that 'Section 13.5.1 - Methodology' is updated to read "*Effects on integrity of peat bodies and their hydrological flow pathways.*"

Q20: Are consultees in agreement with the methodologies proposed and the topics to be scoped out?

Please see our comments on the sections above.

From a designated sites perspective, we note that Eglwys Nunydd SSSI will be scoped in and that the remaining listed sites under section 13.4.7 will be scoped out in terms of hydrology due to the reasons provided.

Q21: Do consultees see value to any particular mitigation and/or enhancement measures for any local or regional receptors, whether referred to above or otherwise?

Please refer to our comments on pollution prevention above.

Chapter 15 – Traffic and Transport

We note that transport within the forestry areas and its impacts has not been considered under this chapter, however we do note that sections 11.6.4 refers to forestry infrastructure being assessed, and we have set out our requirements regarding roads/infrastructure in relation to protection of the environment under comments on Chapter 13.

Chapter 17 – Forestry

Section 17.1.2 – Please note that the open ground areas referred to are felled areas. Open ground created by the felling programme is in the process of being restocked or due to be restocked.

Section 17.1.4 – This also includes Low Impact Silvicultural Systems (LISS) stands of trees managed through continuous cover forestry.

Section 17.1.5 – Please can it be clarified what is meant by minimum intervention practices.

Section 17.2.1 – Please note that NRW is the only consultee regarding WGWE.

Section 17.2.2 – Turbine locations should be sited at locations that minimise impacts on habitats, felling (deforestation) and impacts on the overall trees crops (stability).

Q28: Are consultees in agreement that this provides sufficient guidance for the forestry elements of this wind farm proposal?

Q29: Are consultees in agreement with the proposed methodology and approach for forestry?

Please see our comments above to both questions; we may have additional advice once further information is available.

Chapter 20.3 – Other Existing Infrastructure

Section 20.3.4 – There are a number of illegal unauthorised mountain bike trails within the Bryn forestry block which will need to be identified and considered. This will have to be managed during the construction and operational phase of the proposed development.

Q33: Do consultees agree with the proposal to scope in aviation, Public Rights of Way and scope out impacts on impact on TV and microwave fixed links, gas, water and power lines?

Consideration should be given for all recreational needs, not just Public Rights Of Ways. The Bryn is dedicated CROW Act land which needs to be considered and managed as part of the proposal. Similarly, NRW allow permissive access for horse riding, cycling and general recreation (trail running).

Other Matters

Our comments above only relate specifically to matters included on our checklist, *Development Planning Advisory Service: Consultation Topics* (September 2018), which is published on our [website](#). We have not considered potential effects on other matters and do not rule out the potential for the proposed development to affect other interests.

We advise the applicant that, in addition to planning permission, it is their responsibility to ensure they secure all other permits/consents/licences relevant to their development. Please refer to our [website](#) for further details.

If you have any queries on the above, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yn gywir / Yours faithfully

Hannah Roberts

Cynghorydd - Cynllunio Datblygu / Advisor - Development Planning
Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resources Wales

From:
Sent: 15 January 2021 17:06
To: dns.wales
Cc:
Subject: RE: DNS 3264571- Y Bryn Wind Farm - Scoping Consultation

Dear Giulia

Thank you for your letter of the 15 January asking for comments on the scope of the environmental statement for the above development. I am responding in relation to airfield and technical site safeguarding. The sites identified in the applicant's scoping report appear reasonable. In respect of the methodology, the key issue will be ensuring the site operators have the opportunity to contribute to the preparation of the statement given the technical nature of the assessment and the unique potential impacts for each site. The general approach is therefore satisfactory.

Yours sincerely

Hywel Butts

Pennaeth y Gangen Rheoli Datblygu / Head of Development Management Branch
Y Gyfarwyddiaeth Gynllunio / Planning Directorate
Llywodraeth Cymru / Welsh Government

From: NSIP Applications
Sent: 20 January 2021 10:38
To: Bazzoni Abbiati, Giulia
Cc: NSIP Applications
Subject: RE: HPE CM: DNS 3264571- Y Bryn Wind Farm

Dear Giulia

Thank you for your email dated 15 January 2021 consulting HSE on the pre-application for the proposed Y Bryn Wind Farm development of National Significance (DNS). Please find HSE's advice below.

HSE's land use planning advice

Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances?

With reference to Plan (**DNS-3264571-000042-Y Bryn Forestry 17.1 v3 Land use within the Study Area**, Date 13-11-2020, Draft A1 V3), the proposed project/development does **not** currently fall within the consultation distances of any Major Hazard Installation(s) or Major Accident Hazard Pipeline(s).

However, if prior to the granting of a development consent order for this proposed development, Hazardous Substances Consent is granted for a Major Hazard Installation or there is notification of a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline within or in the vicinity of the development, the HSE reserves the right to revise its advice.

Would Hazardous Substances Consent be needed?

The presence of hazardous substances on, over or under land at or above set threshold quantities (Controlled Quantities) may require Hazardous Substances Consent (HSC) under the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 as amended. The substances, alone or when aggregated with others, for which HSC is required, and the associated Controlled Quantities, are set out in The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015.

Hazardous Substances Consent would be required if the site is intending to store or use any of the Named Hazardous Substances or Categories of Substances and Preparations at or above the controlled quantities set out in schedule 1 of these Regulations.

Further information on HSC should be sought from the relevant Hazardous Substances Authority.

Explosives sites

There are no licensed explosive sites in the vicinity so HSE has no comment to make in this regard.

Regards

Monica

Monica Langton
Divisional Support Team
CEMHD
1.2 Redgrave Court
Bootle

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Y Bryn Wind Farm
Date: 08 March 2021 11:25:20

From: Marks, John D [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2021
To: dns.wale [REDACTED]
Subject: Y Bryn Wind Farm

The above application has recently been brought to my attention.

While the proposal is unlikely to have a major impact upon the Vale of Glamorgan, having considered the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Figure 12.1 Scoping Report) it appears that the development could possibly be visible from significant parts of Glamorgan Heritage Coast which covers an extensive element of the Vale of Glamorgan coastline.

While one of the viewpoints (No.11) included is located at Ogmore by Sea and has been included to represent users of Public Footpath (Wales Coast Path) and Residents of Ogmore-by-Sea, the more natural elements and open areas of the Glamorgan Heritage Coast have not been represented as possibly other viewpoints (20 Bridgend Circular Walk, Bryncoch and 21 Sarn Helen, Aberdulais) have been.

In this regard, you may wish to consider extending the viewpoints within the ZTV to represent the potential impact on the Glamorgan Heritage Coast designation and a view from Nash Point may be helpful.

Thanking you for your consideration on this matter.
Regards

John Marks
Senior Planner / Uwch Gynllunydd
Regeneration and Planning / Adfywio a Chynllunio
Vale of Glamorgan Council / Cyngor Bro Morgannwg
tel / ffôn [REDACTED]
mob / sym [REDACTED]
e-mail / e-bost: [REDACTED]

*Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.
Ystyriwch yr amgylchedd. Peidiwch ag argraffu'r neges hon oni bai fod gwir angen.*

Visit our Website at www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk
Ewch i'n gwefan yn www.bromorgannwg.gov.uk

[Find us on Facebook / Cewch ddod o hyd i ni ar Facebook](#)
[Follow us on Twitter / Dilynwch ni ar Twitter](#)

Correspondence is welcomed in Welsh or English / Croesewir Gohebiaeth yn y Gymraeg neu yn Saesneg.