

**From:** Ian Gardner [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** 25 February 2014 22:30  
**To:** Clocaenog Wind Farm  
**Subject:** RE: Clocaenog Forest Wind Farm (EN010013)

Iwan

I realise that the time for comments has expired but having read RWE's response to the paper I submitted on windfarms and house prices (see <http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010013/2.%20Post-Submission/Representations/Comments/Other%20Comments/Response%20to%20written%20summary%20of%20case%20-%20RWE%20power%20renewables.pdf> ) I would advise that the paper concluded that

'According to the estimation results provided by the spatial fixed effects regressions, there is statistical evidence for a negative impact of wind farm proximity measured by the inverse distance to the nearest turbine.' Sunak and Madlener 2013 p21

RWE have been very selective in their citation of the paper and merely refer to visual impact rather than proximity. Sunak and Madlener show a negative adverse impact on prices due to the latter.

RWE refer to Sims et al (2007 and 2008). I have been in touch with one of the authors over the course of the past few years and Peter Dent visited the Clocaenog when on holiday a few years ago. I took him round the proposed site and discussed his work with him as I have a post grad qualification in economics. With respect to RWE they have ignored two of the studies cited in Sunak and Madlener ( page 5 ) which do show adverse impacts and I would also argue that if we are to discount their study as it is not the Clocaenog, then we should also discount Sims et al (2007 and 2008 ) as Cornwall is not the Clocaenog either.

I would like to draw these points to the attention of the Inspector before she concludes her assessment on this point

Many thanks

Ian Gardner