

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage Scheme](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Deadline 5 submission for Waunfawr residents
Date: 21 June 2016 11:59:39

Dear Stuart Cowperthwaite

I am writing this on behalf of a large number of residents in Waunfawr, particularly those nearby and along the Q1 access route, Cefn Du Road.

As previously mentioned on a number of occasions we are worried about the significant detrimental impact that the SPH scheme will have on the village of Waunfawr both temporally during construction and permanently. Our original concerns were based on the assumption that the 2015 DCO application provided a truthful and realistic representation of the traffic numbers and associated environmental impacts, particularly noise. These concerns remain of great concern to us, but in the light of more recent expert analyses of the penstock design and mode of excavation, we are now concerned about an order of magnitude greater impact from construction traffic accessing the penstock via Cefn Du Road. These impacts will be longer lasting and far more intense than those in the DCO application (which were already 5-10 times worse than the 2012 application passed by Gwynedd Council). Please see Deadline 5 submission Part 1 and 2 by Mike Vitkovitch made 20/06/16 which document an alternative Q6 to Q1 access route and the complexities of penstock construction.

We raise again the issue of why there is a need to use Cefn Du Road at all. If access to the penstock is required at regular intervals to provide adequate ventilation, spoil removal, concrete lining, etc, as indicated by expert analysis, then this access would be best designed to also provide the access to Q1 from Glyn Rhonwy. We refer again to the Deadline 5 submission by Mike Vitkovitch for an example of how a viable direct access route can be constructed and the reasons why this should be the preferred option. We reject the SPH answer to this question (that "there is always someone who has a better idea..") as they never properly investigated this option.

We are concerned that:

1. The 2015 DCO application only reveals a small portion of the construction vehicle movements required to construct an adequate penstock as this requires far more excavation than estimated (please see Deadline 5 submission by Mike Vitkovitch). We are concerned with project duration and time taken to remove and shift slate and other spoil from the penstock route. We could be looking at 24/7 excavation work accessed from both ends of the penstock and the centre for several years. We seek guarantees from SPH that this will not create additional traffic impacts along Cefn Du Road, nor will it involve a worker's village at Q1 or any penstock construction access from Q1. We also seek guarantee from the ExA/the final DCO (if granted) that traffic numbers cannot be increased and construction time frame or hours of construction not increased in any subsequent and less scrutinized process.
2. An access route along the penstock will be required in order to support excavation and spoil removal and this could double up as Q1 access. Landowners are sympathetic to this and none of the consultees have an issue with such a route as long as it avoids major archaeological and ecological sites of importance (please see Deadline 5 submission by M Vitkovitch and Deadline 4 submission by Jane Huuse).

We further ask these questions for the applicant:

If a second tunnel is needed, or a wider tunnel than required solely for the operational phase is needed, how does that impact on the volume of spoil produced and the time and working hours taken to construct the tunnel(s) and disposal of the spoil?

We are deeply concerned that in order to meet investor's expectation of construction time, all options will be considered for construction and slate transport, including accessing penstock from Q1 (specifically stated not to be the case in the DCO application and SPH communication). If the conveyor belt option proves impractical and if there is no direct Q6 to Q1 route then the only option would be to transported slate via the road network through neighbouring villages. Will SPH be able to guarantee that no slate will be transported via the highway network?

If there is a 24 hr concrete dispatching facility needed, please can SPG guarantee that this will not be accessed via Q1?

Please can SPH guarantee that there will be no worker's village at Q1 or accessed via Cefn Du Road?

We look forward to your consideration of these points and welcome any questions to the above or any previous points raised (all of which remain valid).

Yours sincerely

Drs Jane & Mads Huuse

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
