

# The North Wales Wind Farms Connection Project

SP Manweb's Response to Deadline 2  
Representations from Interested Parties

Application Reference: EN020014

Deadline 4 Submission  
November 2015



**SP Manweb's Response to Deadline 2 Representations from Interested Parties**

|                                     |                   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Author                              | SP Manweb         |
| Date                                | 2nd November 2015 |
| Version                             | V1                |
| Planning Inspectorate Reference No. | EN020014          |
| Document reference                  | SPM NWWFC D2R     |

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

| Name of party           | Representation Topic  | SP Manweb Response  |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Eifion Bibby (REP2-002) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plans sent to landowners</li> <li>2. Detail of compensation calculations</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please refer to page 74 of SP Manweb's Responses to Written Representations (Examination Library Reference REP2-015). SP Manweb's response to comments relating to Option B will be submitted for Deadline 5 and/or Deadline 6. Please also refer to paragraphs 5.11 and 5.12 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearings (Examination Library Reference REP3-035).</li> <li>2. Compensation is not a matter for the Examining Authority to consider.</li> </ol>   |
| D E Tyrer (REP2-003)    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Undergrounding impacts on ecology and archaeology</li> <li>2. Cost of undergrounding and fault repair</li> <li>3. Change in weather patterns (future storm and flood risk)</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please refer to the response to First Written Question 8.1 (Examination Library Reference REP1-056) and the comments on responses to First Written Question 8.1 (Examination Library Reference REP2-014). Please also see the response to Denbighshire County Council's Written Representation paragraphs 3.2.6 - 3.2.9 (Examination Library Reference REP2-022).</li> <li>2. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR)(submitted at Deadline 4).</li> <li>3. As set out under the title "Repairs for Faults – OHL" of the Costs Report (referred to above), overhead lines are subject to weather and other environmental interference. However, it is unusual in the UK for natural causes to bring down a 132kV overhead line and they have given reliable service over many years. SP Manweb is confident that its fault repair costs are reasonable and accurate.</li> </ol> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Cefn Meiriadog and Glascoed Road Residents and Users Group (REP2-004)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Design of the connection (life of the project)</li> <li>2. Cost of undergrounding</li> <li>3. Substation appeal and need for the Proposed Development</li> <li>4. Vehicle dimensions and use of Groesffordd Marli to Glascoed Road and Groesford Marli Track</li> <li>5. Working hours</li> <li>6. Viewpoint 39</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SP Manweb sets out its position on the life of the Proposed Development and decommissioning in paragraph 4 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030). SP Manweb confirmed in paragraphs 3.4 and 3.47 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 2 (Examination Library Reference REP3-037) that the Environmental Statement did not assume that the development is reversible for the purposes of the landscape and visual assessment.</li> <li>2. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR)(submitted at Deadline 4).</li> <li>3. SP Manweb has set out its position on the substation appeal at paragraph 3.4 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030). At paragraph 5 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030) SP Manweb confirmed the need for the Proposed Development.</li> <li>4. Appendix 19 and Appendix 20 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030) describes the vehicles that would be used for accessing the terminal pole location and for the Proposed Development generally. Paragraph 3.8.3 of the revised CEMP (submitted for Deadline 4) confirms that SP Manweb will ensure that traffic associated with the construction of the Proposed Development does not use the identified road network</li> </ol> |
|--|--|---|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>during the school drop offs and pick ups period. SP Manweb has confirmed that the Groesffordd Marli track would not be used at all (see paragraph 6.9.5 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030)).</p> <p>5. As set out in paragraph 6.2 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030) any controls over the construction of a development need to be justified. The noise assessment (Examination Library Document Reference APP-104) (noise being the principle construction impact of concern) finds no significant adverse effects. In the context of noise, the impacts are acceptable and therefore there is no justification to impose limited working hours.</p> <p>6. Please refer to point 6, page 11 of of SP Manweb's Responses to Written Representations (Examination Library Reference REP2-015).</p> |
| <p>Dewi Parry and Helen Parry (REP2-005)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visual impact and meaning of magnitude</li> <li>2. Policy on undergrounding</li> <li>3. Costs of undergrounding</li> <li>4. Land use and value</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please refer to Appendix 3 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 2 (Examination Library Reference REP3-037). SP Manweb's position on the meaning of magnitude is set out in paragraphs 3.26 to 3.30 and Appendix 7 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 2 (Examination Library Reference REP3-037). Please refer to paragraph 13 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 2 (Examination Library Reference REP3-037) in relation to the use of term "briefly skyline".</li> <li>2. SP Manweb's position on undergrounding is set out in the Appendix to the Planning Statement (Examination Library Document Reference APP-159)</li> </ol>   |

|                         |   |   |
|-------------------------|---|---|
|                         |   | <p>and paragraph 3.2 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030).</p> <p>3. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR)(submitted for Deadline 4).</p> <p>4. SP Manweb's position on the impact of the Proposed Development on farming is set out in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.18 and Appendix 1 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036). Compensation is not a matter for the Examining Authority to consider.</p>  |
| Dafydd Jones (REP2-006) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultation on design</li> <li>2. Traffic mitigation</li> <li>3. Quality of agricultural land</li> <li>4. Undergrounding</li> <li>5. Socio-economic impacts</li> <li>6. Withdrawal of Nant Bach Windfarm</li> <li>7. Independence of valuer</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As set out in Appendix 6 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (submitted for Deadline 4), consultation is an inherent part of the design and routeing process. Details of the consultation undertaken by SP Manweb are provided in the Consultation Report (Examination Library Reference APP-081). SP Manweb must comply with its obligations under Section 9 and Schedule 9 of the Electricity Act 1989 as set out in paragraph 1.2 of the Planning Statement (Examination Library Reference APP-157).</li> <li>2. The revised CEMP (submitted at Deadline 4) confirms that SP Manweb will ensure that traffic associated with the construction of the Proposed Development does not use the identified road network during the school drop offs and pick ups period. The CEMP also provides for an Agricultural Liaison Officer to ascertain the milk tanker delivery/pick-up times for those farms along the route of the</li> </ol> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>Proposed Development. These times will then be passed onto the contractors to manage the delivery times of the poles to the Order Limits.</p> <p>3. SP Manweb's position on Grade 3a agricultural land is set out in paragraph 3 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036) and page 102 of SP Manweb's Comments on Denbighshire County Council Local Impact Report and Written Representation (Examination Library Reference REP2-022).</p> <p>4. SP Manweb's position on undergrounding is set out in the Appendix to the Planning Statement (Examination Library Document Reference APP-159) and paragraph 3.2 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030).</p> <p>5. SP Manweb's position on the socio-economic impacts of the Proposed Development is set out in paragraph 20.3 of SP Manweb Response to Relevant Representations Document (Examination Library Reference REP1-053) and paragraph 6.1 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036).</p> <p>6. Please refer to paragraph 5 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030) which sets out the need for the Proposed Development notwithstanding the withdrawal of the Nant Bach Windfarm.</p> <p>7. Please refer to Appendix 6 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearings (Examination</p> |
|--|--|---|

|                          |  | Library Reference REP3-035).  |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Simon P White (REP2-007) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Costs of overhead line</li> <li>2. Costs of undergrounding</li> <li>3. Removing pylons from Snowdonia</li> <li>4. Landscape and visual impacts and undergrounding</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR) (submitted for Deadline 4).</li> <li>2. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR) (submitted for Deadline 4).</li> <li>3. It is not appropriate for SP Manweb to comment on the removal of pylons from Snowdonia National Park by National Grid, which is not comparable to the Proposed Development.</li> <li>4. SP Manweb's position on undergrounding is set out in the Appendix to the Planning Statement (Examination Library Document Reference APP-159) and paragraph 3.2 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination Library Reference REP3-030).</li> </ol> |
| JP Hughes (REP2-008)     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cumulative effects on properties</li> <li>2. Landscape impact on Llys Hedydd</li> <li>3. Visual effects from Llys Hedydd</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SP Manweb's position on cumulative effects is set out in paragraph 6 of the SP Manweb Response to Relevant Representations Document (Examination Library Reference REP1-053).</li> <li>2. SP Manweb's response to these comments relating to the landscape impact on Llys Hedydd will be submitted with its response to the Deadline 3 submission by JP Hughes (REP3-022).</li> <li>3. SP Manweb's response to these comments relating to the visual effects on Llys Hedydd will be submitted with its response to the Deadline 3 submission by JP</li> </ol>   |



|                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
|                            |   | Hughes (REP3-022).   |
| Jill Tyrer<br>(REP2-009)   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Residential Amenity Impact</li> <li>2. Impact on sheep farming</li> <li>3. Socio-economic impact</li> <li>4. Ecological impact</li> </ol>                                     | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SP Manweb's assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on the residential amenity of this property is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 - Landscape and Visual Technical Appendix 7.1 (Examination Library Reference APP-132). The significance of visual effect was assessed as being minor (not significant).</li> <li>2. SP Manweb's position on the impact of the Proposed Development on farming is set out in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.18 and Appendix 1 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036).</li> <li>3. SP Manweb's position on the socio-economic impacts of the Proposed Development is set out in paragraph 20.3 of the SP Manweb Response to Relevant Representations Document (Examination Library Reference REP1-053) and paragraph 6.1 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036).</li> <li>4. Paragraph 2.8 of the revised Ecological Management Plan (submitted for Deadline 4) sets out the measures that will be undertaken by SP Manweb in order to minimise any potential impacts of the Proposed Development on bats and birds.</li> </ol> |
| Iwan W Jones<br>(REP2-010) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cost of undergrounding</li> <li>2. Route for undergrounding</li> <li>3. Quality of agricultural land</li> <li>4. Impact on farming</li> <li>5. Cost of maintenance</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR) (submitted for Deadline 4).</li> <li>2. Please refer to Appendix C of the Costs Report (referred to above).</li> </ol>   |

|                               |  |   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
|                               | of trees and hedges                                    | <p>3. SP Manweb's position on Grade 3a agricultural land is set out in paragraph 3 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036) and page 102 of SP Manweb's Comments on Denbighshire County Council Local Impact Report and Written Representation (Examination Library Reference REP2-022).</p> <p>4. SP Manweb's position on the impact of the Proposed Development on farming is set out in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.18 and Appendix 1 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036).</p> <p>5. Please refer to paragraphs 5.19 to 5.22 and Appendix 10 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 2 (Examination Library Reference REP3-037).</p> |
| John Mars Jones (REP2-011)    | 1. Reasons for refusal of pole relocation for Option B | 1. SP Manweb's response to comments relating to Option B will be submitted for Deadline 6.  |
| Pylon the Pressure (REP2-012) | 1. Cost of undergrounding                              | 1. SP Manweb's position on costs is set out in Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Document Reference SPM NWWFC CR) (submitted for Deadline 4).  |