

HeritageCollective

## Proof of Evidence - Heritage

Dr Jonathan Edis BA MA PhD MIFA IHBC

Llandinam Repowering and Extension  
Conjoined Wind Farm Inquiry (Powys)

Session 1: SSAC

On behalf of CeltPower

Heritage Collective Project Ref: 13/0928

CONTENTS	PAGE NO.
PART ONE	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.0 HERITAGE POLICY AND GUIDANCE	12
PART TWO	20
3.0 THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT 2008	20
4.0 SUPPLEMENTARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION 2011	21
5.0 SUPPLEMENTARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION 2013	23
PART THREE	24
6.0 RESIDUAL IMPACTS	24
7.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACT	28
8.0 CONCLUSION	30

## **APPENDICES – BOUND SEPARATELY**

Appendix 1: Jonathan Edis CV

## **PART ONE**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

#### **Qualifications and experience**

- 1.1 I am Dr Jonathan David Edis, BA, MA, PhD, MIFA, IHBC, a Partner in Heritage Collective LLP. I have more than 30 years' experience of development affecting the historic environment, including employment in the public sector as a conservation officer and as a curatorial officer with the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England.
- 1.2 I have appeared as expert heritage witness at nearly 100 public inquiries, of which more than 20 have involved wind farms. My experience of renewable energy in Wales includes the Mynydd y Betws inquiry in Carmarthenshire in 2008, and a number of other schemes in which I and my colleagues have been involved, such as the recently approved Brechfa Forest wind farm and smaller proposals in Anglesey, Ceredigion, Pembroke, and other counties.
- 1.3 A summary of my relevant experience appears at Appendix 1.
- 1.4 I understand my duty to the Inquiry and have complied, and will continue to comply, with that duty. I confirm that this evidence identifies all facts which I regard as being relevant to the opinion that I have expressed and that the Inquiry's attention has been drawn to any matter which would affect the validity of that opinion. I believe that the facts stated within this statement are true and that the opinions expressed are correct.

#### **My involvement in this inquiry**

- 1.5 I was first approached by Celtpower in relation to this inquiry in April 2013. I had no previous involvement in Llandinam wind farm, and I played no part in the production of the original Environmental Statement (ES) or any part of the 2011 Supplementary Environmental Information ("2011 SEI") or 2013 Supplementary Environmental Information ("2013 SEI") (inquiry reference AD-CPL-002 to 023), which was the work of Cambrian

Archaeological Projects Limited, a company that later evolved into Archaeology Wales.<sup>1</sup>

- 1.6 CeltPower's approach to me in April 2013 was made on the understanding that Archaeology Wales would continue to be appointed to deal with direct archaeological impacts, and in a general advisory capacity, because of their longstanding knowledge of the site. Archaeology Wales had informed CeltPower that they would not be able to provide expert evidence at the inquiry for internal logistical reasons (not because of any change in professional opinion), and CeltPower were therefore seeking an appropriate replacement witness.
- 1.7 I made it clear to CeltPower that my appointment would be subject to my first being able to satisfy myself that I could support the proposed Llandinam repowering and extension. Accordingly I made two site visits to the application site (accompanied by the site manager Andrew Williams of SKM) and the surrounding area on 26 April and 1 May 2013, and I met Mark Houlston of Archaeology Wales to discuss the background to the site. I also discussed the case with CeltPower's landscape witness, James Welch, and with members of the legal team and CeltPower's project management team.
- 1.8 Having undertaken these initial site visits and a review of the ES and SEI and other relevant documents, I then assured CeltPower on 3 May that I was satisfied that the Llandinam extension and repowering would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on historic assets, and that I could support their case at inquiry as an expert witness. My first formal appointment followed on 16 May 2013.
- 1.9 This proof of evidence is entirely my own work but at all times I have been in liaison with Mark Houlston of Archaeology Wales to ensure that there is an appropriate level of understanding of the way this case has developed since 2008.
- 1.10 Since my appointment I have undertaken further fieldwork in order to familiarise myself with the area surrounding the wind farm, including

---

<sup>1</sup> I have referred to the Environmental Statement and its supplementary documents as the 2008 ES and the 2011 and 2013 SEI throughout my proof.

observations from key locations in the Caersws Basin, the Clywedog Valley and the River Severn corridor. Part of this fieldwork has included walking on public rights of way, including the entire stretch of the Severn Way between Caersws and Wigdwr (near Oakley Park) in both directions.

## Scope of my evidence

1.11 The impacts of the proposed Llandinam wind farm fall into two broad categories:

- i Potential direct impacts – that is, physical intervention which may affect archaeological structures, either wholly buried or in the form of low earthworks or stoneworks.
- ii Potential indirect impacts – that is, visual changes that will have an effect on the setting of archaeological sites or historic buildings or landscapes.

1.12 There are no issues between the main parties in respect of potential direct impacts, and it is agreed that any disturbance of archaeological remains can be dealt with by way of conditions. For this reason my proof does not discuss direct impacts in any detail, though there are extensive references to this subject in the ES and the SEI.

1.13 Therefore, my proof concentrates on the second category of impacts, namely those visual changes that have a bearing on the setting of historic assets. The character of the landscape in and around the application site creates a close relationship between (i) my evidence on the heritage dimension of that landscape, and (ii) the evidence of my colleague James Welch relating to the contemporary landscape. However, there are some important methodological distinctions to be made between our two proofs of evidence, chiefly:

- That there is a specific tool for dealing with registered historic landscapes in the area – the Caersws Basin and the Clywedog Valley. This is known as ASIDOHL2, and it is discussed further below in respect of the ES and SEI.
- That my evidence usually treats historic assets as the receptors (more specifically, it is the significance or importance of the

feature that is the receptor). While those assets and their settings are part of human experience, I do not normally treat the viewer as the receptor.

- That I do not address any matters to do with residential amenity or visual impact on character areas as they have been defined in the contemporary landscape.

1.14 My proof should therefore be read in conjunction with the proof of my colleague Mr James Welch.

1.15 I attended a meeting between representatives of Powys County Council (PCC) and Celtpower at Llandrindod Wells on 20 May 2013 during which a number of landscape and heritage matters were discussed. During that meeting it was apparent that (i) the council's position in relation to the impacts of the Llandinam wind farm on the historic environment remained unclear at that time and (ii) they were still formulating their position in response to the submission of the 2013 SEI, despite no objection from Cadw and the withdrawal of earlier objections by the Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust (CPAT) and the Countryside Council for Wales (now Natural Resources Wales) (CCW/NRW). Mr Andrew Croft, advising the council on heritage matters, indicated the main remaining areas of interest, namely the effect of the Llandinam scheme on (i) the northern rim of the Caersws Basin, (ii) on the Clywedog Valley registered landscape, (iii) on the setting of a grade II listed building west of Llandinam called Broneirion and (iv) on the setting of a grade II listed building to the north of Llandinam called Plas Dinam. I came away from that meeting with impression that these were the only outstanding issues to be dealt with, and that rather than being the subject of objections they were requests for clarification. This later turned out to be the case, as is described further below.

1.16 In collaboration with my colleague Mr James Welch I prepared further material to satisfy the council's request. This was in the form of five heritage-specific wirelines CH1-5, prepared by Mr Welch, together with a report on the content of those wirelines prepared by myself. The wirelines were submitted to the council on 10 June 2013 and my report was submitted to the council on 20 June 2013. These documents appear at CPL-CUL-005.

- 1.17 On 9 July 2013 PCC formally withdrew its objection in respect of the impact of the Llandinam scheme on the historic environment. This was confirmed in writing in PCC's statement of case, of which paragraph 6.6.1 reads as follows:

*"Since PCC's original objection on cultural heritage grounds, further information in terms of an SEI has been submitted in April 2013. The amendments include deletion of the five most northerly turbines together with other layout alterations. PCC has reviewed this further information and additional material supplied by the applicant. The deletion of the five most northerly turbines has reduced the scale of impact on the Caersws Basin Registered Historic Landscape. Given the current policy context and with regard to the existing wind farm at the site, PCC have concluded that the proposal can now be considered acceptable in Cultural Heritage terms."*

- 1.18 PCC's withdrawal of its objection has resulted in a heritage statement of common ground being agreed between PCC and Celtpower – document CPL-SOCG-008.
- 1.19 The withdrawal of the objection removed PCC's last remaining issues with the Llandinam scheme, which was primarily in respect of its effects on the northern rim of the Caersws Basin historic landscape and the Clywedog Valley historic landscape, and on the setting of the listed buildings at Broneirion and Plas Dinam.
- 1.20 There is, however, one remaining formal heritage objection to the Llandinam repowering, put forward in paragraphs 15 to 19 of the Alliance's statement of case. In summary this objection refers to the effect of the development on the setting and cultural context of monuments in the vicinity of the proposed wind farm, including nationally important scheduled monuments and other regionally important monuments. The Alliance refers to the effect on the 17 character areas within the LANDMAP areas of significant cultural and historic value, indicating that the Llandinam ES and SEI undertook ASIDOHL2 assessments only in respect of the registered landscapes in the Caersws Basin and the Clywedog Valley. My reading of the Alliance's statement of case is that there is no criticism of any part of the ASIDOHL2 undertaken for the Llandinam repowering,

but rather that their case is that the ASIDOHL2 should have been applied more widely.

## **Structure of my evidence**

- 1.21 I have structured my evidence so as to deal first with the policy background, before turning to the principal heritage issues which remain between the main parties.
- 1.22 My proof indicates where my view differs in detail from the ES and SEI, but it is important to stress that I still reach the same overall conclusion – that the impacts of the proposed scheme are not significant in heritage terms. While I do not repeat the ES it should be regarded (subject to any points of clarification) as part of my evidence.

## **Preliminary observations**

- 1.23 From my past experience of assessing the effects of wind farms on the historic environment, and from my review of the Llandinam ES and SEI, I am in a position to make some preliminary observations about the impact of CeltPower's proposed scheme, as follows.
- First, it is important to bear in mind that there is already an operating wind farm on the site, consisting of 102 turbines, 45.5m to blade tip, with rotating blades. This wind farm forms part of the existing baseline conditions within which the Llandinam extension and repowering is brought forward. By substantially reducing the numbers of turbines, and by replacing them with machines that have a calmer appearance in terms of rotation, the visual effect on the historic environment will be greatly reduced. In particular, the new machines (which, due to their size, will require greater spacing), will appear less cluttered than the existing turbines on the site.
  - Second, whilst there will be an increase in the height of the turbines to 121.2m, it does not necessarily follow that the overall effects of the wind farm will be greater than that of the existing wind farm. Indeed, all the evidence in the ES and SEI points towards an absence of significant heritage effects in relation to

the existing baseline, and an overall reduction in impact arising from the Llandinam repowering. Therefore, the Llandinam repowering should be seen as having a positive influence when compared to the effect of the existing wind farm.

- Third, the Llandinam repowering and extension has itself been substantially scaled back since it was first proposed in 2008. Out of the original proposal for 42 turbines, three were deleted in 2011 and a further five were deleted in 2013, demonstrating that the applicant has listened to the objections and comments of other parties and has tried to collaborate and seek compromise solutions wherever possible. One of the most important effects of the contraction of the scheme between 2011 and 2013 has been to reduce the visual impact on the Caersws Basin registered historic landscape, to the extent that PCC, CPAT and NRW have all withdrawn their earlier objections in this regard.
- Fourth, the course of the Llandinam application has been one in which there has been a steady reduction in the number of heritage issues. To me this is a sure sign that there are no overriding or in-principle problems with the scheme. Objections have gradually fallen away, and a number of matters have been resolved, so that the differences between the various parties have narrowed considerably.
- Fifth, there has never been an objection to the Llandinam wind farm from Cadw, the Welsh government's historic advisory service.<sup>2</sup> Significantly, Cadw did not object to the original 42 turbine proposal in 2008 on the grounds of any impact on the registered historic landscapes in the Caersws Basin and the Clywedog Valley. This is an important point, because Cadw asked for these registered historic landscapes to be assessed in the ES when they were very first consulted. Therefore, Cadw must have been entirely satisfied with the subsequent assessment, and they must have been convinced that the effects of the proposed Llandinam wind farm were acceptable in principle.

---

<sup>2</sup> Subject to some micro-siting considerations. The Cadw response is found in Volume II of the 2011 SEI pages 9-10

- Sixth, insofar as there have been objections, the main points have tended to focus on the Caersws Basin, and they have been resolved insofar as PCC<sup>3</sup>, CPAT<sup>4</sup> and CCW/NRW<sup>5</sup> are concerned. While CCW/NRW initially found fault with the ASIDOHL2 of 2008, a matter that has since been fully resolved by the withdrawal of the objection, there has been no criticism of the ES or SEI methodology by any of the main parties.
- Seventh, a direct comparison between the effects of the reduced 34 turbine Llandinam scheme and the effects of other wind farms in which I have been involved suggests that it is relatively benign in terms of its relationship with the historic environment. In my opinion there will be no significant effects on the setting of any listed buildings or conservation areas, which in itself suggests a very low level of overall impact. The main residual effects will be on the setting of a relatively small number of prehistoric scheduled monuments, and a slight visual change in distant parts of the Caersws Basin. Few wind farms in which I have been involved can point to such a low level of impact on the historic environment.

1.24 The ES and SEI has consistently taken the view that there are no significant impacts on the historic environment, and yet Celtpower was prepared to delete three turbines in 2011 and a further five turbines in 2013 in order to address objections that had arisen during the consultation process. In my opinion the position as it stands after the 2013 SEI is entirely acceptable, in that the reduced 34 turbine scheme does not have any significant impacts on cultural heritage. That is to say, there are no effects on the historic environment that should give rise to objections in principle, or that should prevent the grant of planning permission.

1.25 The final position in the 2013 SEI differs in detail from the starting point in the 2008 ES. However, the 2008 ES was in many ways a precautionary document and it remains a robust document. It seems to me that the original 42-turbine layout would have had a greater impact than the revised 34 turbine scheme on the Caersws Basin in particular, and on the

---

<sup>3</sup> See PCC statement of case for session 1 and CPL-SOCG-008

<sup>4</sup> See OBJ-756-001

<sup>5</sup> See CON-003-003

# HeritageCollective

historic environment in general, but that it would not necessarily have been unacceptable in planning terms. It was accepted in the 2008 ES that the wind farm would have a locally moderate impact on some of the character areas within the Caersws registered landscape, but that the overall impact on the registered landscape as a whole would be less than moderate – that is, not significant in EIA terms. I agree with the position stated in the 2008 ES, which (despite the subsequent deletion of turbines and the revision of the ASIDOHL2) was also acceptable to Cadw.

## 2.0 HERITAGE POLICY AND GUIDANCE

### Introduction

2.1 Policy considerations are addressed in the proof of evidence of my colleague Mr Peter Frampton, and I defer to him in respect of the application of policy and guidance. The following section of my proof summarises heritage-specific policy and guidance relevant to the Llandinam extension and repowering.

### Legislation

2.2 The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (CPL-LEG-010) makes provision for the scheduling and management of (normally) unoccupied archaeological structures. In the case of Llandinam wind farm this applies primarily to prehistoric remains described below. The Act sets out a process for managing physical intervention known as scheduled monument consent, but it does not create a statutory framework for the consideration of the setting of an ancient monument. So far as sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings etc) Act 1990 (CPL-LEG-008) are concerned, I have assumed that the tests set out in those sections apply here, irrespective of whether the sections are strictly engaged as a matter of law; indeed, even if the statutory provisions did not apply, the same test, to be applied with the same force and rigour, would still apply as a material consideration. Nothing therefore turns on this point.

### Circular 60/96

2.3 Circular 60/96 "Planning and the Historic Environment: Archaeology" (CPL-CUL-002) was issued by the Welsh Office on 5 December 1996. The circular, which cancelled PPG16 (Wales) is set out in several parts of which (A) deals with the importance of archaeology and (B) advises on the handling of archaeological matters in the planning process. Paragraph 3 of the circular notes that archaeological remains are a finite and non-renewable resource which requires appropriate management, and that care must be taken to ensure that these remains are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed.

## Circular 61/96

- 2.4 Circular 61/96 "Planning and the Historic Environment: Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas" (CPL-CUL-001) was issued by the Welsh Office on 5 December 1996. The circular is arranged into six main parts, of which Part 3 deals with matters to do with listed buildings in detail. Paragraph 11 of the circular (within Part 1: the Planning Framework) advises on the approach to be taken in relation to the setting of listed buildings as follows:

*"Sections 16 and 66 of the Act<sup>6</sup> require authorities considering applications for planning permission or listed building consent for works which affect a listed building to have special regard to certain matters, including the desirability of preserving the setting of the building. The setting is often an essential part of a building's character especially if a park, garden or grounds have been laid out to complement its design or function. Also, the economic viability as well as the character of historic buildings may suffer and they can be robbed of much of their interest and of the contribution they make to townscape or the countryside if they become isolated from their surroundings, e.g. by new traffic routes, car parks or other development."*

- 2.5 Further and more recent advice on the setting of historic assets, including listed buildings, is contained in Cadw guidance described below.

## Planning Policy Wales

- 2.6 Planning Policy Wales (Edition 5, November 2012) (CD-COM-008) Chapter 6 "Conserving the Historic Environment" contains guidance on managing change affecting listed buildings and archaeological monuments, and on the conservation of historic sites.

## Cadw Guidance

- 2.7 Cadw's Conservation Principles 2011 (CPL-CUL-003) sets out a number of helpful definitions and principles which help to establish the significance of

---

<sup>6</sup> The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Note that section 16 is not relevant to this case because there is no application for listed building consent and no physical alteration to a listed building.

historic assets and the effects of change, leading towards an assessment of impact within the overall planning balance.<sup>7</sup> The key definitions are noted here:

Historic Asset:<sup>8</sup> *"An identifiable component of the historic environment. It may consist or be a combination of an archaeological site, an historic building, or a parcel of historic landscape. Nationally important historic assets will normally be designated."*

Significance: "The sum of the cultural heritage values often set out in a Statement of Significance." Conservation Principles 2011 describes four heritage values,<sup>9</sup> namely:

- Evidential Value: Value deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.
- Historical Value: Value deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present.
- Aesthetic Value: Value deriving from ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- Communal Value: Value deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

Setting: *"The surroundings in which an historic asset is experienced, its local context,<sup>10</sup> embracing present and past relationships to the adjacent landscape."*

---

<sup>7</sup> The general language and structure of Cadw's *Conservation Principles* 2011 is similar to that of English Heritage's *Conservation Principles* 2008. In England, some of the terminology was adopted in the now-cancelled PPS5, and it is now to be found in the NPPF. In Wales there is a greater gap between the language of *Conservation Principles* 2011 and the earlier Circulars 60/96 and 61/96, but the approach in *Conservation Principles* is nevertheless very helpful in creating a structure within which assessments can be made.

<sup>8</sup> Broadly equating to a heritage asset in current terminology in England.

<sup>9</sup> These four heritage values are broadly the same as those in English Heritage's *Conservation Principles* 2008. In England the advent of PPS5 in 2010 indicated that setting was also to be considered to be part of the significance of a heritage asset, and this has been more formally stated to be the case in the NPPF, almost as a fifth heritage value. In Wales the policy basis for this is less formal, but paragraph 11 of Circular 61/96 does state that setting is often part of a building's character, indicating a broadly similar approach.

<sup>10</sup> Context is not formally defined in Cadw's *Conservation Principles*, and a straightforward interpretation of the expression "local context" is inferred here. English Heritage's *Conservation Principles* 2008 contained a much more elaborate definition of context which led to considerable debate as to its relationship with the concept of

2.8 *Conservation Principles* 2011 also sets out six principles within which historic assets should be managed and conserved when undergoing change, and it is made clear at a number of points that the setting of a historic asset is of considerable importance. In summary, the six principles set out by Cadw fall under the headings (1) Historic assets will be managed to sustain their values, (2) Understanding the significance of historic assets is vital, (3) The historic environment is a shared resource, (4) Everyone will be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment, (5) Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent, and (6) Documenting and learning from decisions is essential.

## **Guidance on Historic Landscapes**

### ASIDOHL

2.9 The Assessment of Significance of the Impacts of Development on Historic Landscapes (ASIDOHL) is a system of impact assessment first issued as formal guidance in 2003 in relation to development affecting the 36 "outstanding" and 22 "special" historic landscape areas registered by Cadw. It was reissued in a revised form as ASIDOHL2 in 2007 (CPL-CUL-004).

2.10 An ASIDOHL2 assessment was undertaken as part of the 2008 ES in relation to the effect of the Llandinam wind farm on the registered landscapes in the Caersws Basin and the Clywedog Valley (numbered 56 and 57 out of the total of 58 landscapes on the register). The ASIDOHL2 was an integral part of the ES and it complemented and supported the main impact assessment structured on the approach recommended in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), which is accepted as the standard approach to the assessment of impacts on the historic environment at EIA level.

---

setting. However, for the purposes of my evidence in relation to the Llandinam wind farm I take local context to mean only the local context within which a historic asset is experienced.

2.11 ASIDOHL2 contains an introductory note on pages 2 and 3 of the document to the effect that early (pre-ES) consultation with the sponsors is the best way of ensuring that the assessment will be fit for purpose, the test being that “it should contain sufficient information for the ‘responsible authority’, in the case of EIA, or an Inspector in the case of a Public Inquiry, to come to a balanced view in determining the planning application or appeal concerned.” The document places the onus on developers to ensure that the sponsors consider that the ASIDOHL2 assessment satisfies the test. It is therefore relevant that Cadw has never objected to the Llandinam proposal or raised any issue with the ASIDOHL2 assessment in the 2008 ES,<sup>11</sup> and that NRW has withdrawn its original objection to the scheme in respect of impacts on the Caersws Basin, following reassessment and the deletion of some of the turbines. Both Cadw and CCW/NRW are two of the three main authors of the ASIDOHL2 guide issued in 2007.

2.12 The Technical Annex deals with the preparation of ASIDOHL2 assessments, concluding with the fifth stage which is described as follows:

*“This final stage should combine the results of Stages 2 to 4 to produce an assessment of the overall significance of the impact of development and the effect that altering the Historic Character Area(s) concerned has on the whole of the historic landscape area on the Register.” (Emphasis added)*

2.13 This confirms that ASIDOHL2 is designed for assessing impacts on registered landscapes, and that it is designed for assessing impacts on those landscapes in their entirety, not in part.

2.14 The Technical Annex also confirms that the ASIDOHL2 assessment should contain a concluding statement within which there should be “...professional judgement as to how much the development would change our capacity to understand and appreciate the landscape’s historical

---

<sup>11</sup> This is confirmed in correspondence beginning with letters from Cadw dated 15 July 2008 and 26 November 2008 in which it is quite clear that there were no in-principle issues with regard to the setting of any part of the historic environment. No issues were raised in relation to the Caersws Basin. The only issue to be raised was in connection with micro-siting of turbines to keep sight lines between scheduled monuments as clear as possible.

meaning and significance...” Finally, there is specific guidance for the presentation of ASIDOHL2 assessments at public inquiry:

*"The Concluding Statement will be a key part of the ASIDOHL2 report, to which most reference will be made, particularly in a Public Inquiry, when it may be part of a Proof of Evidence submitted to the Inquiry. It is essential, therefore, to write the concluding statement in a clear and concise style that can be easily understood by the non-specialist and the Public Inquiry Inspector alike. In complicated cases, or when it aids clarity, a glossary should be compiled to explain in simple language the meaning of the terms and words used in the ASIDOHL2 report to describe historic landscapes. Historic landscape terminology can be academically obscure to the non-specialist, or have an entirely different meaning in a planning context, which can cause unnecessary confusion. Brevity will also be essential with succinct statements summarising the overall results of the assessment."* (Emphasis added).

- 2.15 It is therefore clear that the authors of ASIDOHL2 saw the concluding statement, including its element of professional judgement, as being the “key part” to which most reference would be made in a public inquiry. The mechanical arithmetical stages leading to the concluding statement (which are not in issue at this inquiry in respect of the Llandinam repowering) are not a substitute for professional judgement.
- 2.16 The relevant professional judgements in respect of the effects of the Llandinam repowering scheme on the registered landscapes of the Clywedog Valley and the Caersws Basin are contained in the concluding statements to the ASIDOHL2 assessments in Appendix 10-2 of Volume 2 of the 2013 SEI. I broadly concur with those assessments, though I consider their overall findings of moderate impact to be highly precautionary. From my experience of the effects other wind farms on the historic environment in England and Wales, the effects of the amended (reduced) Llandinam repowering on the registered landscapes, taken as a whole, are comparatively slight.

## LANDMAP

- 2.17 LANDMAP forms part of an ongoing pan-Wales project of historic landscape assessment. Appendix 10-C in Volume 2 of the 2011 SEI contains a full copy of the Montgomeryshire LANDMAP undertaken by CPAT for PCC in 2006, which is effectively the same as the modern county of Powys. It contains 102 aspect areas ranging from 0.3km<sup>2</sup> to 130km<sup>2</sup>, representing twelve different landscape patterns.
- 2.18 The Llandinam site lies within two aspect areas, the vast majority being within Waun Llestowain (Montgomery Historic Landscape Id. No. 661), characterised by the piecemeal enclosure of marginal land in the 18th and 19th centuries. The eastern access to the site lies within the Kerry Hills aspect area (Montgomery Historic Landscape Id. No. 124), characterised primarily by straight-sided fields indicative of modern agriculture.

## **Local Policy guidance**

- 2.19 In March 2010 PCC adopted the UDP 2001-2016 (CD-COM-006). The UDP contains a number of policies of which strategic policy SP3 (natural, historic and built heritage) is relevant when considering the site specific issues arising from the Llandinam extension and repowering. A number of environmental policies are also relevant, namely:

Policy E3 – criterion 4 – Development should not unacceptably impact on any buildings or features of conservation or archaeological interest.

Policy ENV14 – Listed buildings – development unacceptably adversely affecting a listed building or its setting will be refused. Account will be taken of the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, in the context of the intrinsic architectural and historic interest, the effect on features which justified the listing, the contribution to the local scene.

Policy ENV16 – development that unacceptably adversely affects the character and appearance of historic parks and gardens (as identified on the register) and their setting will be opposed.

# HeritageCollective

Policy ENV17 – development that would unacceptably affect the site or setting of a scheduled ancient monument or an archaeological site of national importance will not be permitted and other sites of archaeological importance will be safeguarded where possible.

Policy ENV18 – relates to field evaluation, preservation in-situ where possible and, where this is not possible, mitigation should be achieved through site excavation, survey and recording of remains.

## **PART TWO**

### **3.0 THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT 2008**

3.1 The main points to draw from the ES 2008 are:

- Proper consultation was undertaken with Cadw, CCW/NRW and CPAT, the three main bodies responsible for providing archaeological advice in this case. Careful attention was paid to the requests made by these organisations.
- A standard assessment methodology was adopted, based on the DMRB. There has been no criticism of the ES methodology by any of the main parties since 2008. The ASIDOHL2 is part of the assessment, and though it was later revised in detail at the request of CCW/NRW there has never been any suggestion that the overall ES/ASIDOHL2 structure is methodologically unsound.
- The 2008 ES contained a summary of residual effects (at sections 10.6 and 10.8) which concluded that the overall effects of the proposed Llandinam scheme were not significant in EIA terms.

3.2 The greatest effects of the proposed Llandinam wind farm, as they were assessed in the 2008 ES relating to the original 42-turbine scheme, were on the north-western margins affecting the Caersws Basin registered historic landscape. It was here that some of the turbines added to the baseline effects of the existing wind farm, causing a moderate impact on some of the character areas within that registered landscape. However, the overall impact on the Caersws Basin was assessed as not significant in EIA terms, a position with which I agree. However, I acknowledge that the subsequent deletion of some of the turbines has reduced the impacts, and this has led to the withdrawal of initial objections by CPAT (OBJ-756-001) and CCW/NRW (CON-003-003). Cadw did not object in principle to the 2008 scheme as it was proposed, or raise any material issues with regard to the 2008 ES (see Cadw letter contained in Volume II of 2011 SEI, Appendix 2-A pages 9-10).

## 4.0 SUPPLEMENTARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION 2011

4.1 The main points to draw from the 2011 SEI are:

- The overall effect of the 2011 SEI was to narrow the heritage issues significantly, and to focus attention on a manageable number of specific sites and areas where (from the point of view of those organisations who were at that time objecting to the scheme, or who had detailed comments on its layout) there might be the potential for significant impacts.
- Three turbines were removed from the layout as part of the 2011 SEI (T22, T23 and T24), and 12 more were repositioned so as to lessen the effects partly on archaeological features. As a result of the revised layout there were new impacts on some 13 sites, all of which were assessed as minor. These impacts, which are summarised in Table 10.6 of the 2011 SEI, have not given rise to further objections.
- The ES methodology was unchanged from that of the 2008 ES, but the ASIDOHL2 assessment was revisited at the request of CCW/NRW.

4.2 The 2011 SEI focused on those residual impacts where further assessment or refinement was needed, and it fell into three main parts, namely (i) high value archaeological features on the site itself, (ii) high value features within 3km of the site, and (iii) high value features up to 10km from the site. The sites where there are residual impacts are listed below.

4.3 High value features on the site itself:

- Giant's Grave Dyke: An early medieval "short dyke", consisting of a double bank and central ditch surviving as an earthwork some 240m long. This structure is located at the far northern end of the application site.
- Pegwyn Mawr cairn I: A prehistoric ring cairn and barrow, probably of Bronze Age date, that would probably have acted as a place of burial and as a boundary marker.

- Pegwyn Mawr cairn II: A prehistoric monument, probably of Bronze Age date, that would probably have acted as a place of burial and as a boundary marker.
- Domen Ddu barrow: A prehistoric monument that would probably have acted as a place of burial and as a boundary marker.

#### 4.4 High value sites up to 3km from the site:

- Plas Dinam: A mid-19th century small country house, listed grade II, standing to the north of Llandinam
- Broneiron: A mid-19th century small country house and garden, listed grade II, with ancillary structures also listed grade II within the grounds. It stands to the west of Llandinam, on the west bank of the River Severn.
- Fowler's armchair stone circle and cairn: A group of probable Bronze Age structures, likely to have been used for burial purposes and as boundary markers, some 2.3km south of the closest turbine.
- Crugyn Llwyd cairn: A prehistoric monument, probably of Bronze Age date, that would probably have acted as a place of burial and as a boundary marker. It lies outside the application site, to the south.
- Caersws Basin registered historic landscape: In broad terms this is between 1km (southern edge of the registered landscape) and 9km (northern edge of the registered landscape) from the application site. However, the registered landscape is about 2km from the nearest turbines at its nearest point, and it is more than 6km from the registered landscape to the southernmost turbines in the Llandinam proposal.

4.5 In my view the 2011 SEI correctly assessed the impacts of the proposal (as it stood at that time), bearing in mind that while there was a significant impact on the nearest character areas within the Caersws Basin registered landscape, the effect on the landscape as a whole was relatively limited. The residual effects are not significant in EIA terms.

## 5.0 SUPPLEMENTARY ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION 2013

5.1 The main points to draw from the 2013 SEI are as follows:

- The 2013 SEI assessed the scheme in light of the deletion of a further five turbines removed from the north-west of the site (T19, T20, T21, T25 and T26). This followed a review of the scheme by Optimised Environments Limited which recommended the removal of the turbines as a means of reducing the visual impact of the Llandinam scheme on the Caersws Basin, both in terms of contemporary landscape and historic landscape. The evidence of my colleague Mr James Welch is relevant in this regard.
- The Caersws Basin remained the main point of issue for CPAT, CCW/NRW, and PCC following the 2011 SEI. Their consultation responses to the 2011 amendments are summarised in Table 10.1 of Chapter 10 of the 2013 SEI Volume 1.<sup>12</sup>
- Indirect effects within 3km were reduced by deleting the five turbines on the north-west fringe of the proposed wind farm (see Table 10.2 of the 2013 SEI) and there was an obvious reduction of the effect on the Caersws Basin registered historic landscape, evident in the revised ASIDOHL2 (see paragraph 10.6.6.6, Chapter 10 of the 2013 SEI Volume I).

5.2 In my opinion there can be no doubt that the reduced layout assessed in the 2013 SEI has an effect on the historic environment that is not significant in EIA terms. The main effects are within the application site itself, where the existing baseline has to be taken into account, and here the net change is not significant - though in my opinion it amounts to a net improvement on the existing conditions. Distant residual effects on the Caersws Basin and the Clywedog valley registered historic landscapes are not significant for the reasons explained in the SEI and in the following parts of my proof of evidence.

---

<sup>12</sup> As part of their response to the 2011 SEI, Cadw had noted the possibility of a new moderate adverse impact on a Bronze Age standing stone that had been designated in 2012. This appears to be a technical change in effect rather than a fundamental issue, and it is proposed to mitigate any effects by introducing a protective buffer.

## PART THREE

### 6.0 RESIDUAL IMPACTS

#### Introduction

6.1 In this section of my proof I discuss those residual impacts of the Llandinam proposal which are either the subject of micro-siting considerations or which have until recently been matters of discussion or debate. In all cases the EIA effects are not significant, but I state my own view as to the effects of the Llandinam scheme on each of the historic assets in turn. The impacts are assessed under seven headings, as follows:

- Caersws Basin registered landscape
- Clywedog Valley registered landscape
- The Pegwyn Mawr cairns and Domen Ddu barrows
- Fowler's Armchair stone circle
- Crugyn Llwyd cairn
- Broneirion
- Plas Dinam

#### Discussion of residual impacts and the weight they should be accorded

##### Caersws Basin registered landscape

6.2 The Caersws Basin registered landscape is divided into nine historic landscape character areas, namely (i) Carnedd, (ii) Penbedw, (iii) Cerist, (iv) Glasgoed, (v) Llanwnnog, (vi) Maesmawr, (vii) (Moel Iart, (viii) Rhos Ddiarbed, (ix) Caersws.

6.3 The ASIDOHL2 assessment, and the 2013 SEI, established that the effects of the proposed Llandinam repowering were not uniform across the Caersws basin registered historic landscape. In my opinion, the approach was precautionary, and the residual impacts on views of the reduced turbine array from the northern rim of the Caersws Basin were slight.

These views were discussed in the document submitted to PCC (CPL-CUL-005), which were instrumental in the withdrawal of PCC's heritage objection in July 2013.

## Clywedog Valley RHL

- 6.4 The Clywedog Valley registered landscape is divided into eleven historic landscape character areas, namely (i) Banc y Groes, (ii) Bryn y fan, (iii) Dylifie, (iv) Faidre, (v) Gorn Hill, (vi) Hafren Forest, (vii) Llanidloes, (viii) Lluest y Dduallit, (ix) Llyn Lwywedog, (x) Manledd, and (xi) Staylittie.
- 6.5 Only the eastern part of the Clywedog Valley can reasonably be said to be affected by the proposed Llandinam repowering, and even this part of the registered landscape is a considerable distance from the turbines. The ASIDOHL2 assessment and 2013 SEI was in my view precautionary, and there are no unacceptable effects on the setting or significance of this historic landscape.

## The Pegwyn Mawr cairns and Ddomen Ddu barrows: Fowler's Armchair stone circle and cairn: Crugyn Llwyd cairn

- 6.6 Some of these prehistoric structures are on the application site itself, and some are outside the application boundary of the Llandinam repowering. They are the most important of a series of prehistoric structures, assumed to date predominantly from the Bronze Age, which acted as burial places and as boundary markers. As a matter of fact there are degrees of visibility between these monuments, and by analogy with observations of other cairn and barrow groups throughout the country there is some evidence that they were sited in locations where they played some significance in the prehistoric landscape. Typically, structures such as these were built on or near summits, or along ridges, where they could be easily identified.
- 6.7 Early in the consultation process, Cadw raised the issue of micrositing some of the turbines in order to reduce their effect on sight-lines between the most important of the monuments. At each stage of the ES and SEI there has been an appropriate response to the suggestions that have been made. The issue is one of detail rather than of principle, and CeltPower

will continue to work with PCC in order to try to achieve the best possible layout that preserves the important relationships between these prehistoric monuments.

## Broneirion

- 6.8 Document CPL-CUL-005 demonstrates the extent to which effects on the setting and significance of the grade II listed building at Broneirion have been reduced. The effect is now so slight as to be effectively imperceptible, resulting in the withdrawal of objections from all the main parties.

## Plas Dinam

- 6.9 Effects on the setting of Plas Dinam, a grade II listed building to the north of Llandinam, have been reduced to the point where the objections of all the main parties have been withdrawn. Amendments to the north-western part of the Llandinam repowering, by deleting eight turbines, have entirely preserved the setting of the listed building.

### **The haulage road and temporary bridge crossing**

- 6.10 An archaeological desk based assessment was prepared by Archaeology Wales to examine the potential effects of the haulage road and temporary bridge crossing over the River Wye Technical Appendix A10-3 in Volume 2 of the 2013 SEI). Direct impacts on the archaeological resource are predicted to be negligible. The temporary indirect effects of the bridge crossing will be of minor adverse significance, and they will be reversible.
- 6.11 In my opinion the heritage impacts are very minor and do not give rise to significant or unacceptable effects on the historic environment.

### **Overall summary of impacts**

- 6.12 In my opinion the ES and SEI consistently adopted a precautionary approach to the assessment of impacts on the historic environment. The eight turbines in the north-western part of the Llandinam repowering, all of which have now been deleted, clearly had a localised effect on the Caersws basin registered historic landscape and on the setting of listed buildings in

the Llandinam area. By taking out these turbines, the overall residual impact of the scheme has been greatly reduced. It is in my view acceptable, and it is comparatively benign in its effect on the historic environment when compared to other wind farms of which I have experience (that is, wind farms that have been tested at appeal and subsequently consented). When the mitigating effect of time limitation is also taken into consideration, the overall summary of impact (although formally represented as being moderate in some respects in the ES and SEI) is in fact predominantly minor in nature.

## 7.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACT

- 7.1 At the opening session of the Mid Wales Inquiry, the Inspector indicated that he wished to hear evidence on the likely cumulative effects of the various developments in separate stages. It is my understanding that in respect of Session 1, the applicants should address the cumulative effects between windfarms that are located within SSA C (including Llandinam Repowering). Session 2 will hear evidence on cumulative effects between windfarms within SSA B whereas Session 4 should address the cumulative effects that may arise between the respective SSAs B and C including both windfarms and the proposed grid infrastructure. On this basis, my Proof for Session 1 focuses on the likely cumulative effects that may arise within SSA C, including Llandinam Repowering. My Proof for Session 4 will address the inter-SSA matters noted above, including the 132kV dedicated grid infrastructure for Llandinam Repowering and the Mid Wales Grid Project.
- 7.2 In response to the decision to hold an Inquiry to determine the project, the Applicant identified a need to bring the cumulative heritage assessment within the ES up to date to reflect changes that have occurred to the baseline since the application was submitted in 2008 and updated in 2011. The cumulative assessment within Section 8 of Chapter 10 the 2013 SEI Volume 1 is the most relevant source for Session 1 of the inquiry because it reflects the up to date position. The analysis contained in my proof refers to this update, rather than the original ES, unless stated otherwise.
- 7.3 Figure A6-1 in Volume III of the 2013 SEI illustrates the degree of windfarm activity in the Llandinam area. The heritage chapter in the 2013 SEI reviews Llandinam Repowering in this context, and it is supported by observations on the ASIDOHL2 assessment. On the basis of my field work it is my view that the maximum threshold at which significant cumulative heritage effects could occur within this landscape is at distances of less 5km.
- 7.4 Cumulative effects are described in the 2013 SEI, and are summarised in Table 10-5 of Chapter 10, Volume 1. In my opinion the 35km radius from the Llandinam repowering was wider than necessary for the purposes of

determining significant effects on the historic environment.<sup>13</sup> In my opinion, cumulative impacts on historic assets are most likely to arise where the historic assets and the two (or more) groups of turbines all fall within 5km of each other. Therefore, the Hirddywel scheme (to the south of the Llandinam repowering) and the Llaithddu scheme (to the south east of the Llandinam repowering) are the only schemes where there is any potential for significant cumulative heritage impacts.<sup>14</sup>

- 7.5 In my view there will be cumulative impacts on prehistoric monuments on and near the application site, including the Pegwyn Mawr cairns, the Domen Ddu barrows, Crugyn Llwyd cairn and Fowler's Armchair stone circle. These cumulative impacts will arise both from the Llandinam scheme in addition to the Hirddywel scheme, and the Llandinam scheme in addition to the Llaithddu scheme. However, these impacts will not be significant in EIA terms.

---

<sup>13</sup> Even NRW, who took the strongest line on the ASIDOHL2 assessments, considered 10km from the application boundary to be sufficient for the purposes of assessing effects on the eastern part of the Clywedog Valley registered landscape.

<sup>14</sup> Other cumulative effects described in sections 10.8 and 10.9 of the 2011 SEI are in my view overstated and are not significant, particularly after the further amendment of the Llandinam scheme in 2013.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The Llandinam repowering scheme represents a noticeable visual improvement on the existing wind farm, significantly reducing the number of turbines and replacing a cluttered layout of “busy” machines with newer models of a sleeker design. This improvement will reduce the impact of the wind farm on the setting and surroundings of those archaeological monuments on and close to the site itself.
- 8.2 In its amended and reduced form, the Llandinam repowering will not have a significant effect on the registered landscapes of the Caersws Basin and the Clywedog Valley. Impacts on Llandinam, and on listed buildings at Broneirion and Plas Dinam, have been all but eradicated by making adjustments to the scheme. The ASIDOHL2 assessments and the analysis of impacts in the 2013 SEI (relating to the amended scheme) based on the DMRB methodology, are highly precautionary in their approach. In reality, the effect of the Llandinam scheme on the historic environment is relatively limited and gives rise to no unacceptable impacts. No significant cumulative impacts will arise in conjunction with any other proposal.
- 8.3 Consultation responses to the proposal since 2008 have in the main been muted, and points of objection have steadily fallen away as the scheme has been amended by a process of negotiation and critical review. Cadw never objected to the Llandinam repowering, though they made some detailed comments on micro-siting. By April 2013 CPAT were content with the eventual removal of eight turbines, lessening the impact on the Caersws Basin registered landscape. NRW followed suit in May 2013, accepting the ASIDOHL2 assessment of the revised scheme. PCC then withdrew their objection on July 2013, after being convinced that the effects on the northern rim of the Caersws Basin, and the effects on the Clywedog Valley and the listed buildings at Broneirion and Plas Dinam were acceptable.
- 8.4 All the professional heritage advisers of the main parties are now in agreement that the effects of the Llandinam repowering are acceptable in principle, including (subject to appropriate conditions) direct impacts on buried archaeology.