

**From:** Tony Grant [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 June 2016 12:35  
**To:** Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme  
**Subject:** RE: Meeting 17th May

Good morning Steffan,

I have just returned from 3 weeks holiday, and have not yet lookrd at the new deadline 4 submissions on your website. However, just to be absolutely sure, I have below cut and pasted my previous submission.

Kind regards for now,

Tony Grant.

Following the meetings held in Llanberis on 17th & 18th May, I realise I failed then to completely address the points submitted by the Applicant in reply to my concerns published for deadline 2. To this end, please find attached a copy of the UNDATED letter posted to residents concerning the proposed 'preliminary site investigation work' commencing 30th March 2015.

FYI, this letter was received less than two weeks before the 30th March commencement date. Since no property surveys had been undertaken by the Applicant, nor had any contingency fund been arranged to accommodate damage occurring during traffic movements, I emailed SPH, as outlined in my deadline 2 concerns. Their reply was:

*Works in May 2015 were investigative and no construction was undertaken. The Applicant has not promised that an independently administered contingency fund to be made available.*

This is both disingenuous and disputatious, since at the Waunfawr Community Council meeting in Caeathro on Monday 30th July 2012, chaired by Eurig Wyn, in response to concerns expressed by residents about any injury/damage to people, property, livestock, etc. arising from HGVs, Dave Holmes said that prior to any work commencing, an independently administered contingency fund would be established. This can easily be verified from the minutes of the meeting, and by querying local residents who were in attendance.

And since the major issue surrounding the scheme with respect to residents in Waunfawr is the proposed use of the Ffordd Cefn Du for HGVs, to claim that 'no construction was undertaken' defies credibility that the Applicant can be so dismissive and oblivious to the real thrust of our objections.

Furthermore, at an open meeting in Caeathro on 27th February 2015, I was told by Peter Taylor, Executive Director of Quarry Battery, that all the properties along the lane would be surveyed prior to the commencement of any work, so that their structural integrity/stability could be independently assessed should any problems or damage arise subsequent to said work/vehicular access. By the same token, the phrase used 'that this was not construction work' gives us no confidence in the reliability or accuracy of any statements made by the Applicant. From your sound recording on 18th May, it can be noted that when asked to explain part of the wording in one of the submissions, the representative from Burges Salmon remarked, 'What does this phrase mean.....?' in the context of how exactly could it be interpreted. The same could be said of most of the Applicant's assertions in relation this scheme, and certainly does not help Waunfawr residents distinguish between preliminary works traffic and construction traffic, with respect to problems arising therefrom.

Continuing with issues arising from this 'preliminary investigative work', the Applicant's reply to my deadline 2 was:

*Vibration monitoring was carried out along Ffordd Cefn Du and due to a contractor delay some of the initial site deliveries were missed.*

Surely it was made clear to the contractor that the VITAL part of the monitoring was to assess the impact of the initial HGVs taking the drilling rigs up to site. ALL (not some) of the initial sound and vibration monitoring site deliveries were missed, although SPH continues:

*however the heaviest deliveries to site were captured by the monitors.*

Since the heaviest deliveries took place on 30th March, this is a preposterous claim.

*Those properties that had monitors installed were not told that they would remain in place until the end of the works.*

Since the main plant and thus HGV movements would be undertaken at the start and end of the work, what purpose could possibly be served by removing the equipment prior to these events? The implication from the undated SPH letter is that the monitoring equipment would be in place for the duration of the relevant period outlined of a month.

*15 heavy vehicles used the road in two directions over the monitoring period  
A 50% increase on the 'approximately 10' in the SPH letter.*

Most importantly, from a resident's perspective is the Applicant's reply to surveying property:

***The applicant still expects to perform property surveys prior to commencement of construction***

This has been placed on record in reply to my deadline 2 concerns, and it prompts the following important question from ourselves, how far in advance of ANY work (including road works prior to construction) will these surveys take place, and how soon after will the surveyors report/s be made available to the property owners? With regard to the concerns already expressed by property owners, how much time/financial help is available to the owners to undertake necessary building work (e.g. underpinning) to help mitigate against possible structural damage? Structural work of this nature takes many months to organise and complete, a realistic timetable must be established to allow said work to be initiated, and should Planning Consent be granted, it is my understanding from the powers invested in the Inspectorate that consent would therefore be contingent upon the surveys being conducted as stated. I would further urge that construction can ONLY proceed following the satisfactory completion of the necessary remedial work undertaken at every affected property.

*As discussed above the purpose of the vibration monitoring was to gather data on the movement of heavy vehicles along Ffordd Cefn Du.*

From the SPH letter, they claimed to provide a 'summary of our findings to the residents along the access route'. As one of said residents whose property directly adjoins this route, I have yet to receive a summary, which is galling considering that with my professional expertise, I should be able to both understand it, and where appropriate, negate its purported findings/conclusions, especially if the audio files were made available.

I would also take issue with the Applicant's claims concerning the background noise levels at the locations stipulated. My own estimates give a reading of less than 30dB (above zero level) on a calm day, but this underlines the absolute necessity of relating ANY acoustic measurements to atmospherics contiguous to the data gathering. There can be a huge variation in background noise depending on the weather conditions, mostly due to wind in this area. Again, these points can be confirmed by referring to the source cited by the Applicant, i.e. the University of Salford.

*Vibration monitoring during the construction period would be deployed to check that the vibration levels are not at levels considered to pose a risk to properties on the road and thus inform whether further action may be required.* Considering the inadequacy of the earlier installations and their purported results to date, I'm afraid this statement does not fill me with confidence that the proposed undertaking will be adequately performed or any adverse data acted upon within time to alleviate any ensuing 'risks' or problems.

Finally, during the meeting on 17th May, the Applicant referred to the scheme as 'beneficial'. My query is - to whom? Listening to the concerns and objections raised from the floor during the meeting, who, amongst the local communities benefit? Every aspect of this development is detrimental to some aspect of the locality - socially, environmentally, ecologically, historically, and commercially. I can understand how many people feel both threatened and intimidated by the bullish attitude of the Applicant towards many components of the proposed scheme, and by the continued uncertainty of many aspects of design and construction which cannot help those affected from taking any immediate steps to alleviate potential problems for the sake of their peace of mind.

I leave you with my earlier observation that I am appalled that the Applicant can be so dismissive and oblivious to the real thrust of our objections.

Tony Grant  
Wauanfawr

