

### Compulsory acquisition hearing-

- Maps to landowners have until the last two months been unclear and contradictory meaning landowners have been unsure what effect the development would have on their land.
- List of important hedgerows in DCO does not include some of the hedges identified as important and lists some that have been assessed as un-important as important hedges.
- The applicant should not be able to plant trees & hedgerows in the (yellow area) temporary order area without the agreement of the landowners and the cost of maintaining such mitigation measures should be the responsibility of the applicant over the long term not just the initial 5yrs.

### Landscape and Visual

- Photomontage picture of the A543 includes tree's that will be cut down to construct the line and therefore give an inaccurate view of the effect of the development. This picture was used in public consultation and therefore has misled the public.
- Contrary to the Holford rules the line does not cross straight across the road and a line of posts are seen running at a 45 degree angle to the road. In the background when travelling towards Denbigh is a windmill at Gwaenynog Bach whilst travelling from Denbigh the Tir Mostyn windfarm can be viewed which increases the 'clutter' effect.
- The effect on the landscape has been understated and the lifetime of the line likely to exceed that of the windmills means the effect would be long term

### Biodiversity

- Area of hedgerows down played, DCO would give right to remove circa 7km of hedgerows. Access stated as being 5m, highway rules in terms of access view and turning areas would lead to much greater lengths being removed. No assessment made of effect of taking large areas of hedgerows.
- The timing of hedgerow/tree removal which to safeguard species is stated as being done in the preceding autumn/winter does not match with the timing of the construction works which are stated to start in Sept 2016.
- Management/liability for hedgerow/ trees that are planted should lie with the applicant not the landowner.

## Socio – Economic

- Tourism survey had not contacted or probably identified most tourism businesses in the study area.
- It was stated that whilst the A543 was described as a principal tourist route that the survey stated that it was 1km away from the development and that there was no view of it in assign it as a minor effect. The effect on the A543 should be reclassified as well as looking at the Brening which has been ignored due to the fact that the actual centre is outside the area not taking into account that part of the lake, cycle tracks and walking paths are in the study area.
- Tourism effect has included mitigation measures as part of the survey some of which the applicant state that there are no guarantees that they will happen such as the 2 for 1 tree planting