



Technical Note

Title:	Mynydd Ty-talwyn Energy Park		
Client:	Galileo 03 Ltd.		
Reference:	2061688-RSKA-TN-004-(01)		
Date:	16 July 2026		
Prepared:	Alex West MIOA	Approved:	Matthew Thomson MIOA

1 Introduction

1.1 Review of the Mynydd Ty-talwyn Energy Park Environmental Statement Chapter 9 (Noise and Vibration) against the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise (June 2026)

1.1.1 Summary position

A Government-commissioned review of noise guidance for onshore wind (WSP, February 2023) recommended a targeted review of ETSU-R-97. Following consultation, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) published the resulting guidance, Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise (ARWTN), on 19 June 2026, replacing ETSU-R-97. The noise assessment in the Mynydd Ty-talwyn Energy Park (the 'Proposed Development') Environmental Statement (ES) was prepared against ETSU-R-97. Consequently, Planning and Environment Decisions Wales (PEDW) has asked the Applicant either to update their ES or to explain why an update is unnecessary. The noise assessment for the Proposed Development has been reviewed against the updated guidance and this note explains why no update is necessary.

ARWTN retains the established ETSU-R-97 method and numerical criteria, and endorses the Institute of Acoustics (IOA) good practice the ES applied. The IOA confirmed by statement in June 2026 that the 2013 Good Practice Guide (IOA GPG) and its Supplementary Guidance Notes (IOA SPGs) remain current good practice. The survey, noise modelling and assessment criteria in the ES therefore all carry over unchanged, and no change introduced by ARWTN would result in a more adverse effect at any noise sensitive receptor than those already identified in the ES. Where ARWTN differs, each change would be likely result in a more favourable outcome for the Proposed Development for the following reasons:

- Noise limits now apply only up to 10 m/s wind speed, removing the requirement for curtailment above these speeds during the night-time;
- Small neighbouring turbines could be excluded from cumulative assessment, potentially simplifying the cumulative position; and
- Further guidance is provided on the methodology for assessing Amplitude Modulation (AM), Low Frequency Noise (LF) and tonality, which aligns with the approach taken in the ES.

In summary, no new significant effects or change to the effect significance as reported in ES Volume II Chapter 9: Noise and Vibration, and supporting appendices, would arise as a result of the new guidance and therefore reassessment is not necessary.

1.2 Status of the new guidance

ARWTN is a targeted update replacing ETSU-R-97 (ARWTN para 1.1). References to ETSU-R-97 in policy, including the Welsh Government endorsement in *Designing for Renewable Energy in Wales* (2023) are now read as references to ARWTN.

1.2.1 Key terms

ARWTN renames the fixed floor the Lower Limiting Value (LLV), the resulting criteria the Total Noise Assessment Criteria (TNAC) applying to all wind farms combined, and each development's share the Site-Specific Noise Limits (SSNLs).

1.2.2 Assessment criteria

ARWTN retains the ETSU-R-97 criteria in full. LLV of 35–40 dB L_{A90} (day), 43 dB L_{A90} (night) and 45 dB L_{A90} for financially involved receptors, or background +5 dB if greater. The same criteria were applied in the ES.

1.2.3 Terminology and noise limits (TNAC / SSNL)

The ES limits are, in ARWTN terms, the TNAC. Limits for individual wind farms follow the IOA GPG Section 5 approach, now formalised as the SSNL.

The ES assessment is undertaken in line with the ARWTN methodology and IOA GPG Section 5 approach and demonstrates compliance, with curtailment applied. No change to the ES is required.

1.2.4 Daytime LLV justification

ARWTN re-orders the three ETSU-R-97 selection factors, giving greatest weight to generating capacity in the national context. The ES adopted 35 dB, the most conservative value the range permits. For a Development of National Significance, the re-prioritised factors could support a higher value.

1.2.5 Baseline survey

ARWTN implements existing practice from ETSU-R-97 and the IOA GPG. The ES survey satisfies each requirement. Based on the above, no re-survey is required.

1.2.6 Cumulative assessment

Under IOA GPG, cumulative assessment requirement is triggered wherever a proposed wind farm fell within 10 dB of existing wind farm noise. ARWTN retains that logic within the TNAC framework and adds two possible allowances, depending on the specifics of the application:

- Screening out receptors where the proposed development is below 25 dB L_{A90} or 10 dB or more below both the day and night TNAC; and/or
- Excluding small turbines ≤ 50 kW, and by demonstration up to a few hundred kW.

Applied to the Proposed Development's assessment of cumulative sites, the following <50 kW turbines could be excluded from consideration:

- Cefn Park (6 kW);
- Baiden Farm Ffordd Y (11 kW); and
- Cwm Risca (11 kW).

In addition, Gelli Las (2 x 225 kW) could be considered to be excludable where it can be demonstrated that noise impacts from these turbines are localised and where including these turbines in a cumulative assessment would result in disproportionate constraints on larger developments.

If all of the above were excluded, this would reduce the cumulative assessment to Y Bryn and Newlands only. Although no change is proposed, if the ARWTN guidance was to be used, the impacts of the Proposed Development would be no worse than those presented within the ES.

1.2.7 Amplitude modulation, low frequency and tonality

ARWTN scopes out the assessment of AM, LF and tonality at the planning stage. This aligns with the approach taken within the ES therefore no change is required.



1.2.8 Conclusion

The assessment reported in the ES remains valid under ARWTN. Each requirement of the new guidance is met by work already undertaken to ETSU-R-97 and IOA GPG standards, with each change either confirming the assessment methodology approach already taken in the ES or likely to result in a reduction in effect. The effects of the Proposed Development, as reported in Chapter 9 of the ES, are therefore conservative and present a worse-case scenario.

An update to the ES is therefore not considered necessary.



