



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:

Response to Squire Saunders Letter dated 31st January, 2014**Clarification on Session 4**

The inspector has considered your letter of January 2014, along with subsequent comments received from the Alliance and Eversheds, and responds as follows:-

The options available for connecting the proposed wind farms have been reviewed in the joint SEI published by four of the applicants in December / January. In its Statement of Case, the Council has indicated an option that it would consider to be acceptable (subject to matters including detailed design and some undergrounding). As its conclusions are based in landscape and visual effects, it is relevant that PPC should bring some landscape and cultural heritage evidence to the inquiry, to support its conclusions. That should, of course be evidence at a strategic or 'high' level, rather than evidence based on detailed assessments, as the details of connection options are not known at this stage and in any event are not matters for consideration at this inquiry. As the potential for the proposed wind farms to be connected to the grid network has always been a matter for this inquiry the inspector does not believe this approach to be incompatible with the position he made clear at the PIM, or that confusion has arisen between environmental information and evidence.

With regard to the Alliance's Statement of Case:

Under 'overall position' this indicates that it is intended to quantify the potential energy generation and emissions reduction arising from each wind farm. This a matter that has been raised in earlier sessions, and the Alliance has already presented evidence in this respect (ALL-SSAC-POE-3). However, the Alliance's letter of 4 February indicates that it is content that the matter of carbon balance should fall under planning balance in the closing session. Further evidence with regard to quantification would be repetitive. However, the overall balance of harm / benefits, including carbon balance (as informed by the evidence already considered), is a matter that the Alliance could address in the final session.

With regard to the need for onshore wind generation the inspector wishes to remind the Alliance of item 14.00 in the Speaking Notes at Annex A to the Notes of the PIM (ID4) The need for onshore wind generation is accepted in UK energy policy (EN-1 - EN-3) and in Welsh national planning policy (PPW). It is therefore the inspector's view that general representations with regard to the need for onshore wind generation should be made in writing.

Sessions 1 and 2 have considered cumulative noise impacts within areas B and C. The inspector is of the view that the separation distance between these areas is such that there is no need for further evidence in relation to cumulative noise impacts.

Some evidence was presented in session 1 with regard to amplitude modulation. This was effectively 'parked', pending the outcome of a UK conference on the topic. It appears for the Alliance's SoC that the deliberations of that conference have now been published. It would therefore be relevant to hear further evidence on this topic in session 4, as a matter in common to all the wind farm applications.

Evidence on the individual and cumulative effects of the proposed developments on cultural

heritage assets has been heard in session 1, and will be concluded in session 2. The inspector is of the view that there will be no need for further evidence about the effects on specific heritage assets in session 4. Again, however, the overall balance of harm / benefits including effects on heritage assets, as informed by such evidence, is a matter that the Alliance could address in the final session.

The inspector trusts that this clarifies his position on the evidence that it would be appropriate to hear in session 4, and is of assistance to the parties in preparing their cases.

The inspector is aware of a request for clarification with regard to evidence relating to the proposed temporary bridge crossing of the River Wye at Builth Wells, and will respond separately to that request as soon as possible.

Andrew Poulter
Inspector
6th February, 2014