

**From:** Eifion Bibby [<mailto:eifionbibby@dmpropertyconsultants.com>]

**Sent:** 13 September 2015 11:37

**To:** North Wales Wind Farm Connection

**Subject:** RE: FAO Steffan Jones- Proposed North Wales Wind Farms Connection Scheme Our Ref- :NWW.Gen

**Dear Sirs,**

We write in reply to the detail referred to in the Applicant's "Response to relevant Representations" report published by the Planning Inspectorate on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2015, for assistance, so as to avoid any misapprehension.

With regard to the title detail of item 14.4 therein (which refers to: "Insufficient information provided and failure to attend site meetings"), in the interest of clarity please note no reference was made in our submission to the "failure" (of the Applicant's representatives) to attend site meetings. The concern as at the representation submission date was that no such site meetings had taken place.

The foregoing detail applies to the Relevant Representations [which forms part of the submission detail (item 4) included for each of our clients on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2015] referred to in Section 14.1.1 (items 19-32, 44 & 45 of Table 14 (pages 113-115) of the Applicant's Response to relevant Representations submitted on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2015 being -:

*"The Applicant has been informed in writing that we are appointed to act as Agents on behalf of the client. However the information received directly from the Applicant in respect of the client is not sufficiently comprehensive and does not fully accord with the detail of the submission. For instance whilst drawings have been provided, "Land Plan Sheets" have not been received. We are concerned it is important for our client to be fully conversant with the impact of the proposed scheme on the subject property so that due representations can be made. To assist in this respect we have, on numerous occasions, sought site meetings with the Applicant's representatives and as yet this has not occurred. Moreover specific information has been requested on the impact of the proposed apparatus and vegetation plantings on our clients property with regard to the temporary and lasting use of agricultural land (which has connotations on the farming enterprise and therefore the client's livelihood). For instance on plantings, whilst we have been led to believe that this would involve improving (rather than expanding) established wooded areas, & existing hedgerows, we have sought detail (yet to be received) on the actual proposals including the acreage affected to ascertain whether this could have a detrimental impact on European Union Direct Payment regulations affecting the land. Accordingly we are concerned that the information received on behalf of the client is presently insufficient and will be continuing to seek for this to be addressed; so that our client is put in an appropriately informed position to decide on the full extent of representations required, whilst the Applicant's submission is being determined".*

In respect of the remarks by the Applicant (in items 14.4.1 & 14.4.17) to the same we comment as follows:

a)As at 28<sup>th</sup> May ,with regard to the information received in respect of our clients being “presently insufficient” /“ not being sufficiently comprehensive” the inclusion of this statement has been vindicated by the subsequent plans issued by the Applicant (appertaining to owner/occupied properties applicable to our clients legal interests) to illustrate areas proposed to be affected in respect of the subject scheme by temporary and permanent rights (including planting areas)which we understand is due to form part of the Option B submission. As explained ,in the foregoing representation detail, this information is considered important so that our clients are duly aware of the lasting impact of the intended scheme on their property (which is necessary for assessing the effect on use and also value) . The plans received by ourselves from the Applicant on behalf of our clients are not the Land Plan Sheets submitted to the Planning Inspectorate (and therefore not all the information thereon is the same which accordingly was found to be somewhat confusing and potentially misleading).

b)Moreover with regard to requests for site meetings, as at the date the said representations were submitted (28<sup>th</sup> May 2015) no such site meetings had been arranged. In this respect, during an appointment with Scottish Power representatives on 19<sup>th</sup> February 2015 a request for site meetings was made . This was subsequently repeated in telephone conversations and a series of e-mail communications (in particularly between 29<sup>th</sup> April and 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2015) . In a telephone conversation with a Scottish Power representative on 3<sup>rd</sup> June we were informed that the Applicant was awaiting design information on previous feedback that had been received when consulting directly with our clients which would result in updated plans being issued. Based on this explanation it was agreed to arrange site meetings upon being informed of such revised plans being available. On 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2015, dates were set to schedule site meetings on 7<sup>th</sup> , 9<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015 to discuss updated information. Unfortunately it transpired at the initial site meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> July that not all the plans had been re-assessed (as the applicant was awaiting supplemental information in certain instances) . However given previous delays the site meetings continued with the aim of seeking to find solutions to address as many of our clients’ concerns as possible (to mitigate lasting adverse impact) in respect of the proposed scheme.

c)Whilst writing in respect of item 14.4.10 ,again in the interest of clarity ,the basis of the calculations (i.e being based on capitalising “enhanced” wayleave payments), but not the detailed mechanics in determining those calculations have been explained .

d)In respect of voluntary template agreements, discussions are ongoing, owing to continued concerns on the extent of rights being sought in perpetuity (and the need to tailor such rights- e.g minimising land areas required for future access to what would be deemed reasonable rather than excessive).

**Yours faithfully**

**Eifion Bibby**

**J Eifion Bibby MRICS FAAV  
Senior Consultant & RICS Registered Valuer**

**For and on behalf of :**

**Davis Meade Property Consultants, Plas Eirias Business Centre, Abergele Road, Colwyn Bay, Conwy, LL29 8BF.**

**Mobile No: 07969 273433 Tel: 01492 510360 Fax: 01492 512151**

**Website: [www.dmpropertyconsultants.com](http://www.dmpropertyconsultants.com)**

