



Electricity Act 1989 (Sections 36, 37, 62(3) & Schedule 8)

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 90)

and the

The Electricity Generating Stations and Overhead Lines (Inquiries Procedure)(England and Wales) Rules 2007

Application by Vattenfall, dated 30 November 2007 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 59.5MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llanbadarn Fynydd')

Application by Fferm Wynt Llaithddu Cyf, dated 7 May 2008 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 66.7 MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llaithddu')

Application by CeltPower Limited, dated 9 May 2008 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 126MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llandinam')

Application by RES UK & Ireland Limited, dated 27 March 2009 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 100MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llanbrynmair')

Application by RWE NPower Renewables Limited, dated 11 December 2008 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 130-250MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Carnedd Wen')

Application by SP Manweb PLC, dated 2 December 2009 for consent under Section 37 of the Electricity Act 1989 to install and keep installed a 132kV overhead electric line connection from the proposed Llandinam Wind Farm to Welshpool Substation

Cyf ffeil/File ref:

Inspector Note Regarding Transport Case & Session 1

I would not wish to hear the entire transport case for Llaithddu during Session 1 in September / October. The reason is that, in addition to specific concerns about the routes put forward by individual applicants, there are wider concerns that there would be 'in combination' effects arising from road works and the transportation of AILs, should a number of wind farm developments proceed more or less simultaneously or over a prolonged period. These concerns transcend individual applications, and involve both areas B and C. The Inquiry needs to consider these 'wider' effects, and this would best be done in Session 4, along with detailed consideration of technical aspects of the main road transport routes, many parts of which would be shared.

The recent Llaithddu SEI (provided through Aaron & Partners) envisages a route from the South including a right turn in Builth Wells over the Wye Bridge, and passing under the railway bridge at Crossgates. The SEI considers this to be feasible and it has been stated that test runs have been carried out which have indicated no insurmountable obstructions. I note that the WG Department for Economy, Science and Transport, which has responsibility for the trunk road network, has not yet accepted that this route would be satisfactory. I also recognise that there may be differences in blade length / tower component size between the different Area C applications. However, if this route is indeed feasible, as it stands I see no clear reason why other Area C applicants could not use it. It may be that there could be some useful discussion of the technical feasibility of the southern route involving all three Area C applicants. A common approach to matters such as the provision of hold points / arrangements for making good damage to highways would seem to make sense and would be helpful. As with other matters, it would be of assistance to the inquiry for areas of dispute to be narrowed down before being considered at the Inquiry. The potential for technical matters relating to transport to be resolved is therefore another reason for preferring the full highways case for Llaithddu to be presented at session 4, rather than session 1.

Andrew Poulter – Inspector
17th July 2013