

North Wales Wind Farms Connection

by SP MANWEB

Application reference: EN020014

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 Application by SP MANWEB for an Order Granting Development Consent for the North Wales Wind Farms Connection

Deadline 3, Friday 16th October 2015.

Post-Hearing Documents, Submission by John Mars Jones, [REDACTED]

Submission 1.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The views of myself, John Mars Jones of [REDACTED] Reference No: NWWFC-AFP047 and the views expressed within this submission represent those of Margret Eirian Jones – Reference No: 10031307, Elin Mars Jones– Reference No: 10031316, Richard Mars Jones – Reference No: 10031308, Elinor Iona Jones – Reference No: 10031309.
- 1.2 The relevant Plot Nos. 75 to 84 (and various subplots) are related to the land within our interests. The relevant proposed Pole Nos. 153, 159 – 174 (inclusive) are related to the land within our interests.
- 1.3 The lands with interest as Owner are those at Berain and Llechryd Bach we also have interest as Tenant at Llechryd.
- 1.4 Further to Written Representation. Submitted for Deadline 1 of 1 September 2015 and Response to Deadline 1 - Submitted for Deadline 2 of 17 September 2015 we have also submitted we have also submitted the representations made at the Open Floor Hearing on the 23rd September 2015 and Compulsory Acquisition of Rights on the 24th September 2015.
- 1.5 The points we wish to raise not only relate to Berain but should also be considered for the effect on other landowners and communities along the entire route.

2 Proposed Development

- 2.1 The Proposed Development is for the overhead line between Clocaenog Forest and Glascoed. This does not represent the full connection required for the distribution of electricity. There is a section of the connection between Glascoed and St.Asaph that is proposed for undergrounding. SP Manweb have stated within their document that they do not consider that an application for this underground section of the connection is not require as it's anticipated that there would not be any objection to it's installation. I would ask the ExA whether this is a material consideration that the installation of the underground section is not determined and subject to challenge and should be considered within the determination of this Proposed Development.
- 2.2 The Proposed Development is for the export of electricity from proposed wind farms and the viability of those wind farms should be questioned given the time required to deliver the Overhead Line (OHL) and that the wind farm developments become uneconomic. This has been extensively discussed and document requested by the ExA to verify the commercial funding for the OHL.

2.3 The Proposed Development has various terms of existence subject to either the lifetime of the wind farms being 25 years, a design life of 40 years or even subject to use. I would stress that we consider that the lifetime of the wind farms or the design life is irrelevant to the extent of time that the OHL line would be in existence. The undetermined influence would be the interpretation of 'use'. As expressed at the hearing we would request that a specific definition of 'use' is provided. The 'use' of the line could be interpreted as either 'import' or 'export' of electricity of any quantity. With the installation of the OHL, and subject to other consents, could apply to connect the OHL from the proposed sub-station with another sub-station in close proximity and thus the OHL would become part of the SP Manweb network and always deemed to be in 'use'.

3 Consultation

3.1 We have expressed concern regarding the consultation process carried out by SP Manweb in previous submission. These relate to;

- Invalid offers dating back to the 26th November 2014. A copy of the letter reference SPM/NWC/HW/51E is attached.
- Lack of consultation on alternative routes.
- SP Manweb have stated they could not consider alternative routes due to the narrow width of the assessed corridor and therefore could not assess the implications outside that corridor.

3.2 We would also express concern that correspondence has been received between SP Manweb and Conwy Borough Council relevant to the undergrounding of the connection at Berain. We express our concern that no discussion has been held between us, the landowner, and SP Manweb regarding this option and would stress the lack of transparency of the consultation process. The correspondence received is

----- Original Message -----

From: [Huw Davies](#)

To: jones@berain.co.uk ; jones@berain.fsnet.co.uk

Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 3:02 PM

Subject: gwybodaeth ychwanegol

Annwyl John,

Dyma'r cynllun i roi'r llinell o dan ddaear heibio Berain. Yn argymhellion i ydi'r darnau coch

Ynglyn a'r achos arall, mi ddaru ni ddweud yn yr 'Local Impact Report'

*6.3.3 - The Council considers that the DCO proposal is certain to have a **Significant (Major)** Impact on the group of Grade 2* and Grade II listed buildings at Berain, for the reasons stated in its Written Representations.*

Tydi Ceri ddim yn poeni am enill dadl am be 'dan ni wedi'i ddweud.

Huw

Mae'r neges e-bost hon ac unrhyw ymgysylltiadau yn gyfrinachol, ac wedi eu bwriadu ar gyfer yr un sy'n cael ei h/enwi yn unig. Gallent gynnwys gwybodaeth freintiedig. Ar gyfer yr amodau llawn ynglŷn â chynnwys a defnyddio'r neges e-bost hon ac unrhyw atodiadau, gweler www.conwy.gov.uk/ebost_ymwadiad

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the named recipient only. The content may contain privileged information. For full conditions in relation to content and use of this e-mail message and any attachments, please refer to www.conwy.gov.uk/email_disclaimer

Attached is the accompanying drawing reference; 2.3.10 Works Plan Sheet 10 modified to show possible areas for undergrounding for Berain.

4 Compulsory Acquisition of Rights.

4.1 Our representation at the Issue Specific Hearing - Compulsory Acquisition of Rights (CAR) are presented in a separately submitted document.

5 Further Submissions

5.1 Further submissions will be provided on the following;

6 Tree and Enhancement Planting

7 Ecology

8 Biodiversity

9 Landscape and Visual Impact

10 Heritage Impacts

11 Biodiversity

12 Land Use, Land Take and Land Management Impacts

13 Farm Operational Impacts (Including EMFs and Noise)

14 Environmental Monitoring

15 Mitigation plans

16 DCO

Trust the above can be considered by the Examining Authority.

Your sincerely,

John Mars Jones