

I have read the statement dated 26<sup>th</sup> August 2013 made by Mike Hale.

My reply to that statement is as follows.

With regard to his comments at paragraph 6.1, I wish to make it clear that in my statement of case I have not used the words illegal military low flying. I have not questioned the professional standards of the military and its pilots. Mr Hale's interpretation is not correct. Mr Hale must read paragraph 9.6 of his own statement. He refers to 'Spokesmen' who were not authorised to release their opinions and views, some of which only serve to confuse the issues. The 'Spokesmen' were RAF personnel. In fact one of them was a squadron leader. Should I interpret this as squadron leader Hale questioning the professional standards of a fellow squadron leader?

In my statement of case, at page 6 (paragraph 7.4) and page 9 (last paragraph), I refer to the skill of the RAF pilots. I want to make it absolutely clear that I hold the RAF pilots in high esteem and their professional standards are to my knowledge, excellent. I will explain in the following paragraph.

One of my cousins served in the RAF during the Second World War. He was a pilot in 115 squadron. He was only 25 years old when he lost his life while on a mission over Germany. He is buried in Hanover War Cemetery. Another relative was the Commanding Officer at RAF Chicksands in Bedfordshire. He died in 2007. I was proud to stand alongside the RAF standard bearers at his funeral. I am very proud of my relatives and admire the skill of the RAF pilots.

If Mr Hale looks closely at the evidence I submitted, he will see, at appendix 7, that I have spoken to the Low Flying Operations Squadron, RAF Wittering, Peterborough and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation, Safeguarding Department, Wind Engineering, based in Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands.

There is a difference of opinion between Low Flying Operations Squadron, RAF Wittering, and Defence Infrastructure Organisation, Safeguarding Department, Wind Engineering, based in Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands. They both use the same grid reference for my post code but they have given different answers as to whether that postcode is inside or outside Tactical Training Area 7 (TTA7).

Low Flying Operations Squadron told me the postcode is on the border of TTA7. Defence Infrastructure Organisation, Safeguarding Department, Wind Engineering, based in Sutton Coldfield, told me the postcode was outside TTA7.

Low Flying Operations Squadron told me that they use the same flying maps as the pilots. These show the terrain and only the place names of large towns. Therefore I concluded that the pilots were not told that the terrain for my postcode was outside TTA7. It is my belief that the pilots would be justified in flying down to 100 feet, because they were not told that my postcode is outside TTA7.

Similarly, it is my belief that the pilots have become accustomed to flying in the vicinity of the existing Llandinam Wind Farm and co-exist with it without any problem. They see the wind farm from the pilot's perspective rather than the perspective of a member of the public standing on the ground. Therefore, it is understandable and no surprise to me that the MoD have not objected to this application. This should not be interpreted as questioning the professional standards of the pilots or illegal military low flying.

I have focussed on TTA7 in my statement of case because it is a defence asset.

At paragraph 8.5 Mr Hale refers to an informal agreement between the MoD Air Staff and the Welsh Assembly, supported by DBERR(now DECC) and British Wind Energy (now Renewables UK) in relation to TTA7. That informal agreement will have a profound effect on many people especially the residents of Powys. I have not found any details of that agreement in the information provided by CeltPower, or anywhere else at the moment, so I only have Mr Hale's version.

The informal agreement, as described by Mr Hale, supports my contention that a defence asset will be compromised.

It appears TTA7 has been divided into North and South. In the North the MoD will accept wind farms. In the South they want to keep the area clear of large turbine projects. The cumulative effect of concentrating wind farms in the North will eventually mean that low flying down to 100 feet is no longer viable in the North of TTA7. In other words the MoD will relinquish full use of the North of TTA7 so they can keep the South of TTA7.

That is a compromise.

The proposed development would significantly impede or compromise the safe and effective use of a defence asset and consent should not be granted.

Peter Brebner

7<sup>th</sup> October 2013