



GLYN PERIS



GUEST HOUSE

Glyn Peris, Llanberis, Caernarfon, Gwynedd LL55 4EL  
T: 01286 872 711 E: stay@glynperisguesthouse.com  
www.glynperisguesthouse.com

25th May 2016

Our registration identification number: 10031932

Dear Mr Cowperthwaite,

Firstly I would like to express our gratitude to you for allowing me the chance to speak at the Issue Specific Meeting on the 17th May and for highlighting our issues to the Applicant and Gwynedd Council.

Something I failed to mention at the meeting was that I would like to know why as far as I can see in the Applicant's 'Response to further third party submissions to Deadline 1' (published 19th April), there was no mention of us or our written representation (published 14th April). We are not listed in the Contents nor are any of our concerns responded to in the core of the document. In other words, we were overlooked (or perhaps ignored) completely.

I was shocked (but not surprised) at the meeting by Mr Boswell's cold hearted comments to our written representation and am disgusted by the arrogance of his and the Applicant's attitude, essentially dismissing our predicaments as being irrelevant as all the magical mitigation will prevent any problems arising. He states that with any major scheme such as this, there will always be some people who may be economically impacted and there has to be a balance. How can he then at the same time essentially dismiss any chance of providing protection for those of us who will be impacted?

I would like to highlight a few queries the latest documents (that I have had time to digest) raise as well as issues that demonstrate that mitigation will be of little use to us as a business.

### **Traffic Management Plan**

#### **2.3.4**

Query: why they have split the traffic generation into weekly trips based on a five day working week when they will be working 5.5 days a week (Monday - Friday 7.00am - 19.00pm and Saturdays 7.00am - 13.00pm)?

#### **2.6.1**

May I raise the point again about our fear of flooding due to run-off from hard standing areas at Q6. We believe that those areas put in place by Gwynedd Council in previous years caused us to flood in November 2012.

Also, once Q6 is filled to its capacity, what guarantee can the Applicant make that water will not find its way along pre-existing tunnels only to be forced along channels that will surface near, or on, our or neighbouring properties? There are a lot of unknowns associated with this quarry and we are hugely concerned about potential flooding.

### **2.7.5 (and 2.7.7 which seems an identical paragraph)**

We appreciate the concession that HGV vehicles will only be able to travel between 8.30am and 16.30pm, Monday to Friday and 9.00am - 13.00 pm on Saturdays but as a guest house these hours will still affect us. The guests may still be in bed or, as we serve breakfasts up until 9.00am our guests are often still in the dining room (at the front of the house) at 9.30am will still be subject to HGVs passing the window.

According to the chart on pages 9 and 20 the average daily number of HGVs that will be passing for 21 months will be approx 48, rising to just below 100 and just over 100 in months 7 and 29 respectively. There will be a total of 39 months of construction. The HGVs will be passing just a matter of feet from the house.

### **Noise management plan**

#### **2.2.1**

The applicant obviously wants the project to be built as quickly as possible for economic reasons so we are not surprised that there will be no mitigation on working hours. As Mr Boswell stated, to work during hours that would have a minimal effect on our business would be so limiting that the whole project would become unviable. Hence it is inevitable that we and our guests will suffer the effects of the working hours.

Those at the front of the house will be awoken by the construction workers driving past the house at 6.30am (or perhaps earlier) to be at work for 7.00am whilst those at the back will be awoken by the construction noise starting at 7.00am. Those having a later breakfast will all then be subjected to the HGVs and other construction traffic passing after 8.30am. On their return to the guest house following a challenging walk up Snowdon they will be relaxing in their rooms to the sounds of the construction work again and later, that of the workers driving past at the end of their working day.

Scheduling noisy work at the beginning of the week will be of no benefit to us as we have guests staying all days of the week.

With the working hours already planned being 12 hours every weekday and 6 hours on a Saturday I cannot think what activities will need to take place outside those times apart from the tunnelling of the Penstock which will be a 24 hour operation.

I have to mention too, that we are not the only business along the A4086 that will suffer; Lake View Hotel, Gallt y Glyn Pub (also accommodation providers) and the Kent Centre (residential outdoor centre) will all be affected by this noise. There are several cottages between the junction onto the A4086 and the entrance to Glyn Rhonwy and their residents will all also suffer from this extra traffic.

#### **2.3.1**

We find it disturbing that the noise and vibration limits will be set collectively by the Applicant and Gwynedd Council.

Does Gwynedd Council have a noise and vibration expert or will they accept the suggestions from the Applicant?

How is it possible that the Applicant can set these limits themselves and also declare an indemnity to any noise claim that we or other businesses/residents may have cause to make?

Who do we turn to if these limits are too high? There is mention of an Environmental Liaison Officer but who will he or she be employed by; SPH, Gwynedd Council or the contractor? How can we be confident that they will remain unbiased and listen to our issues fairly and without prejudice? Surely they will be under pressure to protect SPH, the council and the contractor.

In our opinion there needs to either be a control of the noise and vibrations that will be acceptable to local businesses/residents or the Applicant has to accept that claims will be made against them should any noise/vibration issues arise. They cannot have their cake and eat it!

#### 2.6.2

We appreciate that measures will be taken to try and keep noise levels down but the fact of the matter is that this is 4 years of major construction involving blasting, conveying, crushing, stock piling and drilling on top of all the normal activities involved with construction.

We do not believe that it is possible to bring them down to an acceptable level considering our location.

The Applicant mentions giving local residents advance warnings about blasting but do not tell us how these warnings will be given. For us these advance warnings will be irrelevant as firstly we get bookings up to a year in advance; secondly, as I mentioned in my previous written representation, we are left with the dilemma of whether to warn guests that it will be noisy at the risk of them cancelling their stay or risking them staying with us and suffering complaints and bad reviews as a result of the noise. We are in a no-win situation.

However we think the suggestion of Mike Vitkovitch to have a specified regular time and day of the week for blasting is a good one as long as the NSRs and other residents are consulted as to when will be the best time, thus From our point of view, avoiding the times when guests may be in the building. I dont know how amenable the Applicant or their contractor would be to this.

#### 2.7.4

The Applicant refers to looking at the source and cause of any 'reasonable and specific complaint regarding vibration due to construction activities' but they skirt the issue of noise and make no mention of problems caused by noise apart from saying in 2.7.3 that the community will be informed of 'lines of communication where complaints can be addressed'. They do not reassure us that they will be so receptive to noise related complaints.

#### 3.2.1

Operational noise limits as I understand it will be based on background noise levels at the 'representative NSRs'.

We remain incredulous that we were not considered as a location that needed noise monitoring and only after the meeting on the 17th May has Gwynedd Council stated that we could 'potentially' be included as a location. The council considered the location of Lake View to be representative of both properties. This suggests that the monitoring was for the road noise only. However surely control readings also need to be taken at the back

of our property so as to gauge the impact of the noise when construction begins? I would also like to ask how an accurate idea of noise can be achieved when monitoring is only carried out for a matter of minutes at a time? The noise levels vary at different times of the day and on different days so monitoring for a few minutes here and there does not strike us as being an accurate measure.

We would like to ask what the monitoring was based on. Were the monitors on the A4086 facing the road or the quarries? We suggest that monitors need to be placed both at the front and at the back as noise will be coming from both directions.

We cannot understand the differences in expected noise levels between us and our neighbour Mr Selwyn Hughes. His property also backs on to the site area and is less than 150m from us so there is little difference in the location of our properties. The levels are shown in p 13-42 of the Environmental Statement October 2015. How convenient that his predicted noise limit exceedance is '4' with a moderate 'Significance of Effects' whereas we as a business, are '-1'; a minor 'Significance of Effects'. Without having done any noise monitoring at either of our locations, how can they predict these readings? Where is the accuracy in this?

### 3.4

'There may be a potential for Low Frequency Noise from the operation of the turbines but this is deemed unlikely due to the advancement in technology, the depth of the turbines and the attenuation and building design.' This is not good enough. This 'promise' of yet more mitigation is not convincing us. We need reassurance that if we survive the four years of construction, we will not then be subject to vibration from the turbines causing permanent LFN in the house.

There is no mention of the potential LFN from the fans that will surely have to ventilate the underground Turbine House, nor of the transformers that will be beside the Turbine House.

### 4.4.1

Here there is mention of complaints from noise as well as vibration but there is no mention of the disruption excessive noise/vibration may cause us and other businesses/residents. Once again, measures will be taken to reduce the noise or vibration levels but as indicated earlier, we do not believe this is totally possible. The alternative, the document states, is to cease the activity if it is shown to be infringing on set levels. Our problem is that the levels will not be low enough for us not to be affected. Once we need to make a complaint, our business will already have been affected and we will be suffering. It will be too late.

In summary, we do not feel there can be enough mitigation that will be practically and economically viable enough for the Applicant, to prevent us and other local businesses from suffering the economic effects of the construction of this project and potentially of the scheme once it is in operation. We therefore respectfully request that should this be given the go ahead, clauses are written into the permission that there will be no indemnity from compensation claims. We appeal to you to ensure that the Applicant be fair in their approach instead of having the apparent disregard for the opinions of local residents.

*As I mentioned in my representation for Deadline III submitted in April, "At the public consultation meeting in early 2015, Dave Holmes and Peter Taylor took us aside, away from the general public to sit down and discuss our concerns. We were assured by them both that they are not in the business to destroy peoples' lives. They asked us 'what do we want?' We told them that we wanted reassurance that we and our business would not suffer from the effects of the construction and operation of this scheme and if we did suffer, that we would be compensated for any loss of business. We discussed various options and they assured us that they were open to discussion for compensation. In consequential correspondence we were then told that nothing would be decided until construction begins and now reading this report, further undermines any faith we have in their word. We are stuck in limbo not knowing what will happen to us and our business."*

Surely the Applicant can incorporate a compensation plan, as any ethical, moral and reasonable organisation or government would.

Our lives have been on hold since the first application was made to Gwynedd Council. I personally have spent hours trawling through all the documents in fear that if I don't read everything I may miss a vital issue that needs addressing and with our lack of faith in SPH, their word and their documents, it is a heavy burden. Where is the mitigation for the emotional and physical stress, the fear and the time spent on this instead of running our business? Handling processes such as this one is the profession and full time job for the Applicant's team. We local residents have had to fight for our cause, investing many precious hours trying to untie the legal jargon and thousands of pages of documents that we have been presented with.

We live in fear for our livelihood and our future. We cannot make plans for the future, for any improvements we may want to make to the house and/or garden as we have no idea what state we will be in this time next year and beyond. If we think of selling, the value of the property as well as the goodwill for the business is in jeopardy with this scheme hanging over us.

The Applicant has stated in the past that this project will be of benefit to the local community but the pressures on us all so far, as well as all the negative impacts to come, greatly outweigh the positive as far as we can see.

There are many other issues which gravely concern us as mentioned in our previous submission but these are all being covered by other local residents in great detail and we thank them for the tremendous time and effort put into their representations.

Yours sincerely,

Ceris Meredith and Paul Haydock