

The North Wales Wind Farms Connection Project

SP Manweb's Response to Late Deadline 1
representation from John Fleet

Application Reference: EN020014

Deadline 4 Submission
November 2015



SP Manweb's Response to Late Deadline 1 representation from John Fleet

Author	SP Manweb
Date	2nd November 2015
Version	V1
Planning Inspectorate Reference No.	EN020014
Document reference	SPM NWWFC LD1JFR

SP Manweb plc, Registered Office: 3 Prenton Way Prenton CH43 3ET. Registered in England No. 02366937

Party Making Representation	Written Representation
John Fleet	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>I write again to stress our opposition to pylons which will pass close to our property. The Electricity Act of 1989 states a statutory duty to mitigate any effect on the natural beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>I bought our property 15 years ago to run a day retreat centre for health care workers, staff from Denbighshire County Council and Hospice staff. Part of the day involves quiet walks across our fields and the sloping field to the West of our drive has a wonderful panorama of the Clywyddian hills and the vale of Clwyd. It will be spoiled by a row of pylons. Undergrounding is the standard on the continent and why should our beautiful countryside be spoiled. The developers must bear this cost. I believe the examination officers will be doing site inspections on the 22nd September and I invite them on to my land to see the view and the problem.</p>

SP Manweb Response

1. Mr Fleet both lives at Pen Parc Llwyd and operates a day retreat centre ("the Centre") from the property. There are therefore two different assessments which are of relevance to the assessment of impacts on Mr Fleet's home and business, namely:
 - a. the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (APP-132), which is relevant to the use of the property as a residential dwelling; and
 - b. the assessment of Socio-Economic impacts in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement (APP-102), which is relevant to the use of the property in connection with the Centre (i.e. for business purposes).

Residential Visual Amenity Assessment

2. The Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (see below) recorded a minor effect, stating as follows:

Ref 216 - Pen Parc Llwyd - Individual Property

An isolated detached property which is approximately 320m from the nearest pole located on the centreline of the Limits of Deviation. The receptor is both a residential property and a centre for personal development (business).

Distance to nearest point on the edge of the Limits of Deviation is approx. 310m - this represents the worst case scenario in terms of potential nearest proximity to the Proposed Development.

Although outside the 200m Study Area, this property would have skylined views of the Proposed Development on the rising land above Hafod Farm. The house has a picture window and a garden which are orientated towards the Proposed Development, although intervening vegetation and landform would assist in screening and backgrounding parts of the Proposed Development.

Sensitivity: High, Magnitude: Small

Rationale and Summary: Potential for some skylining of the proposed 132 kV Overhead Line near Hafod as views from the house look up towards the Proposed Development. In other directions, the Proposed Development would be screened or backclothed by vegetation and

landform. The visual effects would also be reduced due to the distance between the house and the Proposed Development.

Minor (not significant)

3. The effect was assessed based on likely views from the main living area of the property and its garden. The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3 (GLVIA3) (para 6.36) notes that when undertaking residential visual amenity assessments, it is occupiers of rooms normally occupied during waking or daylight hours (assumed to be downstairs) that are likely to be more susceptible to changes in their visual amenity, as views from these rooms are likely to be experienced for longer than those experienced by someone briefly passing through an area. The residential visual amenity assessment was taken from publicly accessible locations, and GLVIA3 notes that it is impractical to visit and produce viewpoints for each receptor.
4. It should be noted that the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment is not relevant to the assessment of impacts on the Centre, since the visitors to the Centre are not residents of the property.

Socio-Economic Impact Assessment

5. SP Manweb confirmed in its Response to Relevant Representations that it had not identified a significant adverse effect on the Centre. The Centre is 320m away from the Proposed Development and is unlikely to experience significant effects as a result of the Proposed Development. Due to the lack of significant visual impact, SP Manweb considers that there is also unlikely to be a significant effect on the business aspects of the Centre. There is the potential for some temporary construction activities in the vicinity of the Centre but these are not considered to result in any significant impact on the ability of the business to operate or on the users' enjoyment of the centre.
6. On the accompanied site visit it was pointed out that a meadow area was used by clients at the Centre. SP Manweb had not previously been given this information, despite pre-application consultation, and even now only has this statement made by the owner. In light of this new information SP Manweb has considered the use of the meadow as part of the "retreat", and can confirm that this does not affect the original socio-economic assessment undertaken in relation to the retreat, which considered that the Proposed Development would not result in any significant impact on the ability of the business to operate or on users' enjoyment of the centre, as the Proposed Development would be in excess of 200m from the meadow. .