

Response to:

8.1 - Do you agree with the applicant that the benefits that would be derived from undergrounding the cable as a means of reducing visual effects are likely to be outweighed by the effects of underground cables on habitats, ground cover, land management and unknown archaeology? Please provide a brief explanation.

SP Manweb's proposed 132kV overhead line will have an adverse impact on the landscape not least in terms of visual disamenity, which can be mitigated by burying transmission lines underground (or "undergrounding").

As a farmer who has to maximize the use of land throughout the year in order to sustain numbers of livestock and feed for the winter months, any obstacle that may disturb this flow could have a detrimental effect on the business. The proximity of the double poled pylons will affect the flexibility of land management, whether it is arable, forage or grazing land. Their presence will undoubtedly have an impact whilst making key decisions on land use from season to season.

SP Manweb lack evidence to back their statement when highlighting the effects of underground cabling on habitats. In terms of socio-economic value, reducing the visual effects of overhead cabling should prioritise over the effects listed by SP Manweb in which they fail to demonstrate their significance and their extent.

On my land, the proposed route crosses over a deep descending valley/dingle which is also characterized by ancient woodland. As part of the operation a mass felling of trees would have to occur affecting the landscape but more importantly the wildlife that habitat in the woodland e.g. deer, foxes, badgers, rabbits, door mice, barn owls, buzzards, squirrels, woodpeckers etc.

I strongly believe that the impact of a tree cull of this magnitude on habitat outweighs the effects that underground cabling may have on the same issue.

Tree felling of this magnitude should be prevented especially for the sake of overhead cabling.