

Response to Deadline 3 Submission – Specific Hearing Day 3 and Appendices.

Appendix Three.

Photo of HGV Articulated vehicle for transporting poles to Broadleys farm. The photo has been conveniently cropped in size so that the tail end of the trailer is not shown therefore the overhang of the poles is not visible either.

Photo of 18T Flatbed lorry for transporting poles to lay-down areas. There is no indication of how this vehicles (which is classed as a HGV) can transport the poles to the lay-down area. There would obviously be a significant overhang at the rear of the vehicles when compared to the HGV articulated vehicle. It appears that the crane/Hiab fitted on this vehicle would restrict any poles overhanging the cab. Therefore SP Manweb is still yet to demonstrate how they can transport the poles to the laydown areas using this 18T Flatbed lorry on narrow and tortuous roads.

Appendix Twelve.

Tourism Questionnaire.

The introduction and information provided on the questionnaire/given to respondents is purposefully vague, totally inadequate because it does not give any specific details on the proposed development. The context of the development is nonexistent - no details are provided on the length of the overhead line, the route description, the type and height of poles, the short and long term environmental impacts.

How would a respondent be able to give any reliable responses without proper explanation and details of the proposals? To compound the flawed survey, the interviews were carried out by telephone therefore the respondents were not have the ability to see the proposals on any drawings/photomontages – this is something that surely should have been provided to complete such an important survey.

Question 18 asks questions about the impacts of substation however the only detail given on the questionnaire is that its located at Clocaenog Forest which is thousands of acres – no details have been provided on exactly where in Clocaenog Forest, the size of the substation or the impacts it would have. Again, how could the respondents give any meaningful answers without this information?

Question 21 asks: Do you see any potential benefits to your business from the proposed Overhead Line and Substation? e.g. provision of accommodation to construction workers. This is totally unacceptable method of carrying out surveys as the interviewer is giving a biased answer that would assist the case of the proposed development in terms of providing positive benefits. This is blatantly confirmed in 11.6.29 of Chapter 11 of the ES – Socio-Economic and Tourism where its noted that ‘One respondent noted that the Proposed Development could have a positive impact on business trading – principally through workers coming to the area during the construction period.’ It is no wonder that this respondent made this statement as the questionnaire/interviewer provided this answer for him/her.

It is totally evident that the questionnaire is biased because as a direct comparison Question 19 asks: 'If you think there will be negative impacts, do you think they will be short, medium or long term?' However, there is no suggested negative answer to this question.

The fundamental question that should have been asked in the interview is; 'Do you consider that an underground cable would have less impact on your business than an overhead line?' The answer would have been a resounding and conclusive YES.

To conclude, based on the biased questionnaire, response rates and businesses not interviewed along the route, the assessment and conclusions of the tourism report is flawed, biased and should not be considered as true reflection on the impacts on tourism in the area. The impartiality of the report is again called into question.

Appendix 3.12 – Construction programme.

There are some discrepancies between the construction programme Rev 25 (dated 18.02.15) in Appendix 3.12 compared to the construction Programme in Figure 5.1 of the Design and Construction Report. The latter includes a period of 3.5 months for foundations and pole erection whilst the programme dated 18.02.15 only allows a period of two months (November and December 2016). Additionally the Figure 5.1 programme allows five months for conductor stringing compared with a period of four months on the programme Rev 25 dated 18.02.15.

There is no indication of which programme is the correct one although it would appear that Figure 5.1 is the latest given that this was contained in the most recent report of March 2015.

Overall there is quite a difference in time taken from commencement to commissioning with Figure 5.1 indicating a 13 month period compared with 9 months on Rev 25 dated 18.02.15 - this programme also assumes mobilisation and LV diversions commencing before the Development Consent Order decision is made which would be seen as pre-judging the Minister's decision.

What is becoming very clear on Rev 25 programme is that all activities are becoming compressed and there are serious doubts if the programme is achievable. There is no indication if allowances have been made to obtain the required environmental licences (such as Dormouse). It is also very doubtful if 218 structures (436 poles) can be erected in two months. Any shortening of activities will certainly have a detrimental effect including additional vehicles on the roads. Any changes to shorten the programme will require the Design and Construction and Traffic and Transport Reports to be updated and issued for further comments.

SP Manweb needs to confirm which programme is correct and provide additional detail/activities to cover all the constraints including gaining the environmental licences – this is required to demonstrate that the programme is robust and achievable.

SP Manweb's Comments on Responses to First Written Questions – Deadline 2 Submission.

Page 71&72 of 102

Effects on Residential Property From Heulog and Bwlch

SPM response acknowledge that Bwlch will experience primary views in the direction of the Proposed Development and the visual receptor is considered to be highly sensitive to the development. However, SPM state that existing vegetation will screen some views from the garden and ground floor of the property. Below are two photos taken on 01.11.15 from the patio which adjoins the ground floor living room (original digital photos available if required).



View from Bwlch in south/south westerly direction



View from Bwlch towards Tan-yr-Allt (westerly direction)

As can be seen from the photos, there is little if any existing vegetation that would screen the current unspoilt views towards the proposed development. It is quite clear that the proposed development is highly visible from Bwlch for over 2km. The existing SP Manweb and BT poles are currently visible therefore the proposed poles (9- 10m above ground level) and the conductors (additional 2m above poles) would be highly visible, hence, I'm at loss to understand how SPM have considered the magnitude of change to be 'small and as such, minor and not significant'. SPM continue to state that in terms of visual amenity 'it is highly unlikely that the proposed Development would prohibit or materially affect the panoramic views from the house or garden'. This statement is baffling and biased – it is obvious that the views from Bwlch will be substantially affected and the proposed development will materially affect the enjoyment of our property (I'm sure the Inspectors site visit demonstrated this point).

In addition, no mention has been made on any views from the Holiday Cottage in the response.

Peris G Jones

BEng CEng MBA MICE CIHT