

The Alliance

Conjoined Public Inquiry

Comments on Amplitude Modulation Conditions

1. PCC Proposed Condition:

- a. The Alliance is generally in agreement, but would like to add an additional paragraph as follows:

‘In the absence of (a) a review of the scheme for the assessment and regulation of AM shall be conducted periodically .’
- b. The reasons for a periodic review are stated in Paragraph 40 of the Alliance PoE ALL-NOISE-NOTE-S4. A note should be added as follows:

‘Any scheme devised by the Developer and agreed by the LPA may be overtaken by new information, for instance guidance subsequently issued by the Government or the IoA. This is especially important in view of the rapid advances in understanding of the causes of AM and its psychological effects. An invariable condition applied now may prove to be inappropriate at some time during the 25 year lifetime of the windfarm.’

2. Llanbadarn Fynydd Condition 62:

The Alliance objects strongly to the deletion of PCC’s words ‘if it exists at the time of submission’ and the addition of paragraph (c) by the developer. Paragraph (c) describes the 16 December 2013 Renewable UK methodology, which has been demonstrated as unsuitable as detailed in Alliance PoE ALL-NOISE-NOTE-S4 paragraphs 31 to 36.

3. Llanbrynmair Condition 58, Llandinam Condition 60, Carnedd Wen Condition 53, Llaithddu Condition 53

No alternative/proposed condition given by the developer.

4. Matthew Cand’s note of 6 May relating to amplitude modulation (CPL-014)

- a. We must **vigorously resist** the addition of Mr Cand's paragraph (c) to the conditions. His paragraph (c) describes the 16 December 2013 Renewable UK methodology, which has been demonstrated to be very badly designed, as detailed in Alliance PoE ALL-NOISE-NOTE-S4 paragraphs 31 to 36.
- b. Mr Cand acknowledges in his statement that the ReUK planning condition would need to be validated by the Institute of Acoustics before it could be used. In the very unlikely event that the IoA were to endorse the ReUK methodology, Mr Cand's paragraph (c) would become redundant.
- c. Paragraph (c) would allow the ReUK methodology to be used even if it was not endorsed by the IoA.
- d. PCC's words 'if it exists at the time of submission' should be added after 'That scheme shall be in general accordance with'
- e. We have no objection to Mr Cand's definition of amplitude modulation.