

- The results of SP Manweb's primary and desk studies lack detail and are a misrepresentation of the areas' landscape, wildlife and environment. Their ecological and environmental observations are an overview of the route and appear vague and lacking in detail. I for one know that these primary studies have not been conducted accordingly and corners have been cut. For instance, the Hafod dingle valley, part of my land where the proposed line crosses, has not been investigated on foot. This section of the route is an area of significance in terms of the wildlife that habitat here, the landscape, and other natural features. This area of woodland is a significant habitat for many wildlife species and contains other natural features such as a waterfall and a historic cave. This area of the dingle valley where the line supposedly crosses consists of an 80m drop. A proposal of this magnitude would have a detrimental impact on wildlife here and the isolated landscape. SP Manweb's application has effectively dismissed many ecological and environmental effects as being insignificant, based on their own subjective analysis. This is a complete contradiction to my knowledge.
- Pylons are a negative externality to all the residents of this area who receive no benefit from the proposed development.
- Overhead lines and pylons cause a significant blight to property values, up to 20% in some cases where pylons can be seen from the residence. My property/farmhouse is identified by SP Manweb under the assessment of Cumulative Residential Amenity Effects as significantly affected by the proposal. For me personally, and for the sake of my family's future, this could potentially be a financial burden. From the business perspective, pylons and overhead cabling pose significant issues. Pylons take up valuable land and they will have an impact on farming decisions concerning the use of land from season to season. They will restrict my flexibility in terms of what I can do on my own land. There are also issues concerning health and safety, specifically when livestock are grazing in fields containing pylons and when agricultural machinery are being used to conduct essential land maintenance work.
- There are no areas along the route suitable for pylons. SP Manweb has dismissed the underground option on the basis that "the costs of a fully underground solution were unacceptable and therefore this was not taken forward". However, the cost of the overhead line is not presented and so it is impossible to determine the incremental cost of undergrounding, and there is no transparency in their cost-benefit calculation. Energy losses are up to 50% less by undergrounding. Both Conwy and Denbighshire County Councils have passed motions for full undergrounding; this being a policy in Conwy.