

The North Wales Wind Farms Connection Project

SP Manweb's Response to Late Deadline 1
representation from Eifion Bibby

Application Reference: EN020014

Deadline 4 Submission
November 2015



SP Manweb's Response to Late Deadline 1 representation from Eifion Bibby

Author	SP Manweb
Date	2nd November 2015
Version	V1
Planning Inspectorate Reference No.	EN020014
Document reference	SPM NWWFC LD1EB

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

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS LODGED BY MR EIFION BIBBY (ON BEHALF OF THE CLIENTS LISTED IN THE TABLE BELOW) AFTER DEADLINE 1 THAT RELATE TO OPTION A

1. The Examining Authority has exercised its discretion to accept a number of written representations that were submitted after the relevant deadline (being Deadline 1, which was on 1 September 2015).
2. This response is in respect of those written representations submitted by Eifion Bibby. These representations were published on the PINS' website on 15 September 2015 ("**the Late Representations**"). The Late Representations concern matters that relate to Option A and matters that relate to Option B.
3. SP Manweb's responses to the matters raised in the Late Representations are set out within the third column of the table which commences on the following page. **SP Manweb's responses in the table are confined to only those matters that relate to Option A.** SP Manweb will respond separately to the matters that relate to Option B.

Respondent	Written Representation	SPM Response (in relation to matters that concern Option A only)
<p>Eifion Bibby on behalf of Messrs EW, PA and EW Hughes</p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Further to our telephone conversation of earlier today , in respect of Scottish Power’s Option A proposal, we confirm that our above mentioned client has asked that we request the Planning Inspectorate ,please, to visit the subject affected land in their ownership so as to be in a position to comprehend the requests made for the following modifications to the scheme proposal -:</p> <p>A. In order to reduce the significant impact of the proposed scheme on agricultural use of the subject silage/arable land, our client is seeking:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. that proposed poles 112 can be located due west adjoining the 5m wide field access track ,but not obstructing the same and existing field gate (and abutting the northerly perimeter of the arable land)as approximately shown in green by “x” on appended Site Plan 1. 2. that the existing field gateway as approximately shown in green by “ G” on attached Site Plan 2 will not be obstructed by proposed poles 117. <p>B. That access rights, along the driveway in the direction of Eriviat Hall, to Messrs Hughes’ agricultural land are not extinguished and suitable temporary alternative access measure are provided during any affected period.</p> <p>C. That no trees will be planted along the A543 roadside boundaries owing to concerns regarding the effects on</p>	<p>Points 1 and 2 relate to Option B and will be responded to separately.</p> <p>Access to Eriviat Hall</p> <p>SP Manweb is currently negotiating the terms of an agreement with these individuals which would require SP Manweb to implement measures to protect these access rights. In any event, under the terms of the Order (Article 23), access rights would only be suspended and unenforceable or, where so notified by SP Manweb, extinguished in so far as their continuance would be inconsistent with the exercise of the right created and acquired. The rights SP Manweb is seeking over the driveway are not inconsistent with the existing access rights and therefore the existing access rights would not be suspended or extinguished.</p> <p>Landscaping impacts</p> <p><u>Tree Planting</u></p> <p>Requirement 5 of the development consent order has been updated to accord with discussions during the hearings. It applies to the planting to take place on the dark green land and the dark green stippled land shown on the Land Plans.</p> <p>The dark green land on the Land Plans are the areas where new trees, shrubs and other soft landscaping is proposed (Class 3 Rights) for enhancement or mitigation purposes.</p>

	<p>highway safety and the liability for the future maintenance cost of such trees abutting the highway (to account for a tree surgeon and to include traffic management controls) . Also it is our clients preference that no trees are planted abutting the driveway leading to Eriviat Hall and on non roadside boundaries abutting the subject land owing to enhanced difficulties & cost resulting in the maintenance of such perimeters as well as reduced productivity owing to canopy shading of prime agricultural land. Our client is content for hedge plants to be located along the perimeter as approximately shown between points A-B on appended Site Plan 1 (on the basis ,of course, that the access gate is not obstructed) .</p> <p>To confirm inspection arrangements, Messrs EW Hughes can be contacted on _____.</p> <p>We ask that the contact numbers, please, are retained confidentially.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p>	<p>The requirement provides that SP Manweb will submit to the relevant planning authorities for approval a written landscaping scheme (following consultation with relevant landowners). There will also be a maintenance scheme for this planting, again to be approved by the relevant planning authorities.</p> <p>The stipple green over the yellow land on the Land Plans are the areas where new trees, shrubs and other soft landscaping is proposed (for enhancement or mitigation purposes) which is on land that will be used for temporary construction works (Class 2 and Class 3 Rights). This planting will be subject to the same provisions as in relation to the dark green land on the Land Plans.</p> <p>The relevant planning authorities, therefore, are the final arbitrators over where new planting should be located.</p> <p>Requirement 7 of the development consent order has been updated to accord with discussions during the hearings. It applies to the planting to take place on the blue and yellow land shown on the Land Plans. The yellow land and blue land on the Land Plans are the areas where reinstatement planting is to take place (i.e. where hedgerows have been removed to enable the construction of the Proposed Development, these hedgerows will be reinstated).This reinstatement may also include improvements to vegetation; e.g. where a hedgerow had gaps, the Applicant would intend to restore those gaps.</p> <p>This reinstatement planting can only include improvement measures on the blue and yellow land where agreement has been reached with the relevant landowner over the improvement measures.</p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Maintenance</u></p> <p>SP Manweb will be responsible for maintaining the planting carried out under requirements 5 and 7 for a period of years as is agreed with the relevant planning authorities (a minimum of 5 years). After the agreed period, the landowner would have the responsibility for maintaining the planting. The cost of this maintenance would either be included in any negotiated voluntary agreement or would form part of the compensation claim should SP Manweb need to utilise the compulsory acquisition powers in the Order.</p> <p><u>Canopy Shading</u></p> <p>In relation to the impacts of landscaping on agricultural productivity resulting from canopy shading, we refer to Document reference SPM NWWFC Comments on WRs (REP2-015), , which notes that it is a generally accepted agricultural principle that trees and woodland can make a contribution to agriculture, including providing shade and shelter, prevention of erosion, protection of water resources, as well as having conservation and wildlife benefits.</p>
<p>Eifion Bibby on behalf of Mr DR & Mrs EM Owen</p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Further to our telephone conversation of earlier today , in respect of Scottish Power's Option A proposal (given that we understand Option B has not yet been submitted for consideration), we confirm that our above mentioned client has asked that we request the Planning Inspectorate, please, to visit the subject affected land in their ownership so as to be in a position to comprehend the requests made</p>	<p>Point 1 relates to Option B and will be responded to separately.</p> <p>Point 2 - Landscaping impacts</p> <p>Please refer to SP Manweb's response above to the representation of Eifion Bibby on behalf of Messrs EW, PA and EW Hughes in relation to landscaping impacts. SP Manweb adopts the same response in relation to this</p>

	<p>for the following modifications to the scheme proposal (in order to mitigate a lasting impact) :</p> <p>1.That proposed Poles 179 (together with stays) could be re-located within the neighbouring wooded parcel to the east (in the direction of Poles 178) to reduce the significant impact on productive agricultural land (and interference with the roadside gateway to the parcel).</p> <p>2.Also that no trees are to be planted on the roadside perimeters (appertaining to our client's property –including the subject field and to the south of Tyddyn Bartley driveway entrance) owing to concerns on highway safety and the future cost of maintenance [albeit hedge plants within gapped areas, along the boundary (excluding, of course, the gated access facility to the agricultural land) would be permitted].</p> <p>To confirm inspection arrangements Mr Owen can be contacted on _____ or by email: _____.</p> <p>We ask that the contact numbers and email address ,please, are retained confidentially.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you. Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Eifion Bibby</p>	<p>representation.</p>
<p>Eifion Bibby on behalf of Mr AA & Mrs CA Owen</p>	<p>Dear Sir, Further to our telephone conversation of earlier today, in respect of Scottish Power's Option A proposal, we confirm that our above mentioned client has asked that we request the Planning Inspectorate, please, to visit the subject affected land ,in their ownership, so as to be in a position to</p>	<p>Point 1 relates to Option B and will be responded to separately. Point 2 - Landscaping Impacts Please refer to SP Manweb's response above to the representation of Eifion Bibby on behalf of Messrs EW, PA</p>

	<p>comprehend the request made for the following modifications to the scheme proposal.</p> <p>1. In order to reduce the significant impact of the proposed scheme on agricultural use of the subject forageable pasture land; AND also as this parcel was specifically purchased with the aim to seek planning consent to erect a rural enterprise dwelling on own land (abutting the farmstead of the adjoining Tenanted holding farmed also by Mr Owen) our client is seeking that the apparatus (Poles 175 -177) ,if not feasible to be undergrounded, are located as close to the public road boundary ,and with the least stays, as possible .</p> <p>2. Also that no supplemental trees are to be planted on the roadside perimeter owing to concerns on highway safety and the future cost of maintenance [albeit hedge plants within gapped areas, along the boundary (excluding, of course, the gated access facility to the agricultural land) would be supported].</p> <p>To confirm inspection arrangements (which we understand are scheduled either on Tuesday 22nd or Wednesday 23rd September 2015) Mr Owen can be contacted on_____.</p> <p>We ask that the contact numbers, please, are retained confidentially.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Eifion Bibby</p>	<p>and EW Hughes in relation to landscaping impacts. SP Manweb adopts the same response in relation to this representation.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Eifion Bibby on behalf of Messers HW, EA & GW Hughes</p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Further to our telephone conversation of earlier today , in respect of Scottish Power's Option A proposal (given that we understand Option B has not yet been submitted for consideration), we confirm that our above mentioned client has asked that we request the Planning Inspectorate, please, to visit the subject affected land in their ownership so as to be in a position to comprehend the requests made for the following modifications to the scheme proposal -:</p> <p>A.</p> <p>i) In order to reduce the potential impact of the proposed scheme on agricultural use of the subject land [which consists, we understand, of heavy clay (as well as peat in part) and prone to being particularly wet ,especially ,in the winter, along significant sections of the intended route corridor] , our client is seeking that pole 119 is moved as far to the west of the adjacent field boundary fence as possible , as the current proposed position would dangerously impede on a narrow corridor available during, in particular, winter months for access via farm vehicles extending from the south to the north of the subject agricultural land .</p> <p>ii) a proposal for re-alignment between Poles 120-123 (inclusive) so as to reduce the number of stays required.</p> <p>iii) that the existing field gateway as approximately shown in green by " G" on the attached map extract will not be obstructed by proposed poles 117?</p> <p>B. That access rights, along the driveway in the direction of Eriviat Hall ,to Messrs Hughes' agricultural land are not</p>	<p>Point A relates to Option B and will be responded to separately.</p> <p>Point B - Access to Eriviat Hall</p> <p>SP Manweb adopts the same response set out above in relation to the same matter raised in the representations made on behalf of Messrs EW, PA and EW Hughes.</p> <p>Point C - Landscaping Impacts</p> <p>SP Manweb adopts the same response set out above in relation to the same matter raised in the representations made on behalf of Messrs EW, PA and EW Hughes.</p>
---	--	--

	<p>extinguished and suitable temporary alternative access measures are provided during any affected period .</p> <p>C. It is our clients preference that no trees are planted abutting the driveway leading to Eriviat Hall, and on non roadside boundaries abutting the subject land, owing to enhanced difficulties & cost resulting in the maintenance of such perimeters as well as reduced productivity owing to canopy shading of prime agricultural land. Our client is content for hedge plants to be located along the perimeter as approximately shown between points A-B on the appended map extract (on the basis ,of course, that no field access provision is obstructed).</p> <p>To confirm inspection arrangements, Mr H Hughes can be contacted on _____</p> <p>We ask that the contact number, please, is retained confidentially.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Eifion Bibby</p>	
--	---	--