

The North Wales Wind Farms Connection Project

SP Manweb's Response to Post Hearing
Submission from Interested Parties submitted at
Deadline 3 Part 2 (Meilir Jones, Meirick Lloyd
Davies, Peris G Jones, Pylon the Pressure
Group, Robin Barlow, Simon P White)

9th November 2015

Application Reference: EN020014

Deadline 4 Submission



The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

The North Wales Wind Farms Connection Project

SP Manweb's Response to Written Representations

Author	SP Manweb
Date	November 2015
Version	V1
Planning Inspectorate Reference No.	EN020014
Document reference	SPM NWWFC PHSIP2

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

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
Meilir Jones	<p data-bbox="371 264 1084 344"><u>Effect of proposed development on future development plans</u></p> <p data-bbox="371 368 1084 580">Mr M Jones considers the Proposed Development will have an unacceptable impact on his development of a new dwelling near to Hafod Farm. Planning permission has been granted. His particular concerns relate to the effect the development will have on his views.</p>	<p data-bbox="1106 260 2047 379">The development plot referenced in Mr Jones's letter was assessed as part of the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (since it lies within 200m of the Proposed Development).</p> <ol data-bbox="1155 400 2047 1070" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1155 400 2047 703">1. The worst case scenario would be such that the (as yet unbuilt) residential building was orientated with unobstructed primary views to the west, facing directly onto the Proposed Development at a distance of some 90m. The proximity of the alignment and the likely skylining of poles in these views could result in moderate and therefore significant visual effects. This judgement may be at the higher end of the moderate scale of significance. <li data-bbox="1155 724 2047 1070">2. Mr Jones also raised concerns about the impact on the value of his property of the proposals. This has been fully responded to in the responses to Relevant Representations, Section 3 Compensation and Property Values (Examination Library Reference REP1-053). The Assessment immolation to this property is in Appendix 1 of this document (extract taken from Appendix 7.1: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment in relation to this property, examination library reference APP-132).
Meirick Lloyd Davies	<p data-bbox="371 1166 1084 1246"><u>Letter of support from Ann Jones AM dated 3 August 2015 provided</u></p> <p data-bbox="371 1270 1084 1342">Ann Jones AM states she writes in support of the communities which wish the connection to be</p>	<ol data-bbox="1155 1166 2047 1334" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1155 1166 2047 1334">1. The approach to routeing and consideration of undergrounding was considered during ISH1 and ISH 2 (paragraphs 3.25 – 3.28 of ISH 1 Oral Summary and Appendices (examination library reference REP3-030) and paragraph 3.48 of ISH 2 Oral Summary and Appendices

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>undergrounded rather than an OHL, and notes that the route goes through Cefn Meiriadog in the Elwy Valley and will affect the communities of Cefn Meiriadog and Henllan and states that it would seem a sensible proposal to place the cables underground so as to preserve the landscape.</p>	<p>(examination library reference REP3-036)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The approach to routeing and consideration of the alternatives has also been presented in the response to Issue Specific Hearings Day 1 (ISH1) Action 6a submitted at Deadline 4 (Examination library reference REP3-030). 3. SP Manweb's approach to undergrounding was set out in the Appendix to the Planning Statement ((DCO Document Reference 7.5) (examination library reference APP-159)) and has been further considered in responses to points raised by the Examining Authority at ISH1 (Actions 7, 8, 9a, 9b, and 10). 4. Impacts on the communities of Cefn Meiriadog and Henllan were specifically considered and no justification for undergrounding in this location was identified due to the level of landscape and visual impacts.
<p>Peris G Jones</p>	<p><u>Landscape and Visual</u></p> <p>PG Jones has queried the methodology relating to the residential amenity assessment and why his property (which is also a holiday let) has not been considered</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Desktop measurements using SP Manweb's GIS mapping shows the distance from the edge of the property Bwlch (a holiday let) to the centre of the Limits of Deviation is just under 400m (370m from the edge of the Limits of Deviation). At this distance the apparent height of the pole structures when viewed at arm's length would be approximately 2.3cm. At these distances, and with the scale and spacing of the poles, the effects of the Proposed Development would not be significant. 2. SP Manweb's comments on responses to First Written Questions

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>(REP1-056), explained on page 52 that, because this property lies more than 200m from the Proposed Development, it is unlikely to experience an overbearing effect on visual amenity and therefore was not included in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment in the ES.</p> <p>3. A response to Llanrhaedr yng Nghinmeirch Community Council regarding effects on views from Bwlch was provided in SP Manweb's Comments on Responses to First Written Questions. The response concluded that:</p> <p><i>'Bwlch will experience primary views in the direction of the Proposed Development, which lies to the west of the property over 370m from the edge of the Limits of Deviation. The residential visual receptor is considered to be highly sensitive to the development. The closest 4-5 poles will appear approximately 3cm high in the view.'</i></p> <p><i>'Existing vegetation will screen some views from the garden and ground floor of the property. The magnitude of change is therefore considered to be small and as such, the overall significance of the effect on residential visual amenity is considered to be minor and not significant. In terms of visual amenity it is therefore highly unlikely that the Proposed Development would prohibit or materially affect the panoramic views from the house or garden.'</i></p>
Peris G	<u>Socio-economic Impacts</u>	This property was not identified on the list of businesses during the initial

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
Jones	<p>PG Jones runs a holiday letting business. He queries why his business was not considered and more generally the reliability of the assessment is questioned.</p>	<p>tourism business baseline audit/search. The audit does not maintain that it will identify 100% of all such businesses but rather as many as can reasonably be identified from online sources.</p> <p>The approach adopted to the business survey as part of the assessment was on the basis of an audit of businesses followed by a telephone based contact survey. This approach was set out in the consultation letter to the authorities and other agencies to determine their acceptance, but at no time was a face to face survey requested or recommended. Hence, the approach was interpreted as being sound and robust.</p> <p>Please also refer to paragraph 6.1.2 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036) relating to the validity of the business survey undertaken.</p>
Peris G Jones	<p><u>Traffic and Transport</u></p> <p>(1) Table 12.1/12.2 states that no Transport Assessment will be completed due to the transport values being too low i.e. 5%. The 5% relates to DMRB which is the adopted standard for trunk roads. There is no evidence to confirm that the Local Highway authority was content with this approach – a lower %age is often stipulated by Highway Authorities which would affect the traffic assessment.</p> <p>(2) Paragraph 12.5.13 and 12.5.17 states average 3.0m wide roads with irregularly located passing places. If the</p>	<p>1. The reports have been submitted to both highway authorities and no adverse response was made at any stage in the process. Conwy County Borough Council in its Local Impact Report at paragraph 6.8.2 states that "<i>the Council does not raise substantial concerns in respect of the highway and traffic implications...</i>". Denbighshire County Council in its Local Impact Report at paragraph 13.5.1 states that it considers that the Proposed Development "<i>would have a Neutral impact on the highway and footway network subject to controls over the timing of construction works.</i>" The Outline Traffic Management Plan confirms that the programme of construction works will minimise the overlap between activities that generate higher flows on the road</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>average is 3.0m then it is evident that the roads are narrower in places than 3.0m. However paragraph 12.7.8 identifies that typical articulated vehicle dimensions to deliver 16m long poles would be 3.1m wide which suggest that the roads would not be capable of accommodating the delivery vehicles without modifying the existing roads. In addition, no information has been provided on the locations of existing passing places therefore it has not been demonstrated if construction/delivery vehicles and local traffic can pass each other safely.</p> <p>(3) 12.5.19 (Appendix 12.1). Traffic surveys should be carried out in 'neutral months'. The majority of the traffic counts were carried in at the latter end of November which is just on the limit of the neutral months – guidance suggests that November surveys can be carried out providing adequate lighting is available, however, there is no evidence to confirm if this was the case. Some traffic counts were also carried out in December which are outside the neutral months.</p> <p>(4) 12.7.12 confirms that the conductors would be delivered on cable drums. No information has been provided on the dimensions or weight of the cable drums as often the weight of the loads determines if they are classified as AILs.</p>	<p>network. The final Traffic Management Plan is to be approved by the relevant planning authorities pursuant to Requirement 13 of the DCO.</p> <p>2. The width description relates to the local track and unclassified roads, these will not be used by articulated vehicles for delivery. The poles will be delivered to the main compound at Broadley's Farm and the identified temporary storage areas at Clocaenog and St Asaph by HGV's but these vehicles will not use the local tracks and unclassified roads. From the storage areas at these compounds the materials will be moved by a Hiab lorry to the individual laydown areas. 12.5.19 (Appendix 12.1).</p> <p>3. The surveys were undertaken to obtain an average daily flow based over one week and the approach taken is consistent with guidance in TAN 18 'Transport' Appendices D and E and has been used along with The Department for Transport's publication entitled "Guidance on Transport Assessment" (GTA) dated March 2007. The requirement to undertake surveys during neutral months relate to Design for Bridges Design Manual guidance for the assessment of the trunk and motorway networks. None of the roads surveyed are part of this network. In addition the neutral month relates to seasonal effects that can occur i.e. school holidays or major shopping events i.e. Christmas build up. The network assessed is local, no major shopping areas are in the area as such the variation in the flows will be minor in nature and the week long survey would average out small changes on any</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>(5) 12.7.14 – there is no logical explanation as to why the route has been assessed in 1.5km sections. Indeed there is no evidence to support the assumption that three accesses are available off the highway along the 1.5km sections. Given the potential impacts on local traffic, making these broad assumptions is not acceptable or logical in terms of assessing traffic movements. Further details and justification required.</p> <p>(6) 12.7.15 confirms that a 5m wide access is required to accommodate construction vehicles. 12.5.13 and 12.5.17 identify 3.0m access as being suitable for delivery vehicles – no consistency here.</p> <p>(7) 12.7.16 confirms that the exact access routes to each location are not known – this questions the robustness of the traffic assessment and the environmental impact assessment i.e. if the routes are unknown, how can the environmental impact have been assessed?</p> <p>(8) 12.7.21 states that it would be reasonable to assume that each team would progress the installation rate of two complete structures per day. There is no evidence to support this assumption – it appears to be unrealistic.</p> <p>(9) 12.7.24 - the number of poles being quoted are incorrect – a total of 218 poles have been identified for the whole</p>	<p>one day. The surveys set out only one overlapped day in December <u>and for only 1 day</u> thus the flows for this month are considered representative of the traffic flows in the area.</p> <p>4. The Design and Construction Report (Examination library reference APP-154) sets out that the conductors will be delivered by general purpose vehicles and will not require any Abnormal Indivisible Load ("AIL"). A load that does not exceed the maximum load of a rigid and articulated vehicles is not an AIL. The drums do not require specialist vehicles for delivery and are thus not considered to be AIL's.</p> <p>5. The development will be built by individual gangs of 5-6 people and they will work on a 1.5km stretch of line at any one time. Therefore the transport assessment has been taken forward on this basis as the vehicle movements will relate to each gang of workers.</p> <p>6. Paragraph 12.7.15 refers to the creation of accesses (or modification to existing) to enable construction vehicles to undertake construction works. The access width of 5.0m including the visibility splay, will allow construction vehicles to turn into these accesses. Paragraphs 2.5.13 and 2.5.17 refer to the existing road network and do not refer to junctions where vehicles require turning space to complete their manoeuvre. There is therefore no inconsistency.</p> <p>7. The assessment focuses on the significance of effect the Proposed</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>route. This is factually incorrect and should refer to 218 structures which equates to 438 poles. Given that the workrate and programme has been calculated based on the number of poles that can erected/gang/day, the fact that double the amount of poles need to be erected suggests that the programme would take twice as long and the vehicle numbers quoted in Table 12.6 are incorrect.</p> <p>(10) 12.7.25 - again no explanation on why 1.5km sections used. Given the error in 12.7.24, 10 working days should be 20 working days to based on the output.</p> <p>(11) Table 12.6 – given the errors in calculating number of poles in 12.7.24, the movements of vehicles quoted are incorrect. This confirms my suspicion that the table is seriously underestimating vehicle movements. The calculated two way flows of 34 vehicles/day used in the remainder of the report is therefore incorrect.</p> <p>(12) 2.6.1 refers to new access track being 10m wide, with temporary accesses being between 5 and 7m – this is inconsistent with the Traffic and Transport report which quote 3m and 5m.</p> <p>(13) 5.7.8 No design details provided for accesses of highways onto the construction site. These accesses would need to provide safe access including visibility splays</p>	<p>Development will have on the major road network and therefore flows to and from the Broadley's Farm compound and the compounds at St Asaph and Clocaenog have been considered. Traffic using the local road network will be far lower by the nature of the construction process (i.e. that all materials are delivered to the compounds and then vehicles deliver to individual laydown areas along the route in 1.5km stages). Therefore the primary issue for the local road network is the safe operation of the unclassified network rather than a capacity issue.</p> <p>8. The construction periods are based on experience of SP Manweb and construction teams who have undertaken a number of schemes of this nature and can be considered representative.</p> <p>9. The Assessment of Construction Movements in Chapter 12 'Traffic and Transport' of the ES (paragraph 12.7.6) states: 'The current design includes a total of 218 structures – 2 terminal, 128 intermediate and 88 angle type which includes 8 failure containment structures. The design of the terminal pole incorporates four poles in order to support the cable terminations. The 218 structures will therefore require a total of 438 wood poles..' Therefore, it is confirmed that the assessment has been correctly based on traffic flows required to construct a 218 double wood pole 132 kV Overhead Line.</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>(which can be up to 215m either side of the junction for a 100kph design speed) to allow safe sight stopping distance. It doesn't appear that the local highway authority have been consulted to agree the design parameters for these accesses, therefore it is not clear how the environmental impacts could have been assessed. Given the number of accesses required off the highways, extensive removal of hedges are likely to be required.</p>	<p>10. The 1.5km length has been set out in the Design and Construction Report (DCO Document Reference 7.1). This is used to provide a guide as to the number of movements and vehicles types needed to construct the line over this length, the time taken to obtain an average daily flow and overlaps where two activities may be undertaken at the same time, to provide a worst case flow situation for assessment.</p> <p>As stated above, the development will be built by individual gangs of 5-6 people and they will work on a 1.5km stretch of line at any one time. Therefore the vehicle movements will relate to each gang of workers and the working days and flows are calculated on this basis.</p> <p>11. The above responses clearly show that the conclusion reached in the ES is correct and the assessment has used the correct representative flows.</p> <p>12. The width quoted relate to the field tracks to allow two way movements to take place if required, the narrower widths relate to the access point where two way movements are not required.</p> <p>13. As is standard practice, the detailed design of access arrangements have not been prepared. Rather, the locations have been identified, the majority of which are in a location where there is an existing gate in to the field, with Requirement 9 of the DCO providing that no works to construct or alter any permanent or temporary means of access to</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>a highway must commence until the design and layout has been approved by the relevant highway authority.</p> <p>Therefore the final design of the access remains subject to the control of the relevant highway authorities.</p> <p>The ES has assessed the location of the proposed access arrangements, and is therefore considered adequate.</p>
Peris G Jones	<p><u>Design and Construction Report</u></p> <p>(1) 2.6.1 refers to new access track being 10m wide, with temporary accesses being between 5 and 7m – this is inconsistent with the Traffic and Transport report which quote 3m and 5m.</p> <p>(2) 3.6.2 – states that overhead line solutions are more economical than underground cable, however, there is no evidence to support this statement.</p> <p>(3) 3.6.4 states that undergrounding cables is four times more expensive than overhead lines – again no evidence or justification for this statement.</p> <p>(4) Overemphasis on economics with no justification – how do SP Manweb put a price on the environment – the O/H lines will ruin the countryside forever.</p> <p>(5) 4.2.11 suggests that mitigation has been used near Tan yr Allt. The report however fails to mention how close the</p>	<p>(1) The Examining Authority requested that clarity was provided in respect of the width of the access tracks required for the construction of the Proposed Development. This was provided for Deadline 4, Please refer to DL4 Appendix 21 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>(2) SP Manweb has provided evidence to the examination which clearly sets out why an overhead line solution is more economical than an underground cable. This was originally explained in the technical appendix to the Planning Statement (Examination library reference APP-159). In addition submissions have been made in the following (non-inclusive): Response to First Written Question 1.17 (Examination library reference REP1-056) and Lifetime Costs Report (Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings) (Examination library reference REP3-030).</p> <p>(3) Please refer to point (2) above.</p> <p>4) SP Manweb develops its proposals in accordance with relevant statutory requirements. For example as set out, in terms of undergrounding, in Planning</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>O/H lines are to Tan yr Allt and the fact that the views from the Bwlch would be spoilt with no possible mitigation.</p> <p>(6) 5.7.8 No design details provided for accesses of highways onto the construction site. These accesses would need to provide safe access including visibility splays (which can be up to 215m either side of the junction for a 100kph design speed) to allow safe sight stopping distance. It doesn't appear that the local highway authority have been consulted to agree the design parameters for these accesses, therefore it is not clear how the environmental impacts could have been assessed. Given the number of accesses required off the highways, extensive removal of hedges are likely to be required.</p> <p>(7) 5.7.1 refers to 5m access tracks – do SP Manweb know whether they are 3m, 5m or 10m access tracks?</p> <p>(8) 5.20.1 states that underground cables are usually permitted development for SPM. Why on earth are they therefore wasting their time and money, as well as the countless objectors to this proposal on proposing an OH line. This money would be far better spent on developing an underground cable solution.</p> <p>(9) 5.20.5 categorically states that for underground '132kV cable systems are maintenance free other than for non-invasive periodic electrical tests.' This statement totally</p>	<p>Statement Technical Appendices reference 7.5).</p> <p>(5) Chapter 7 of the ES 'landscape and Visual (Examination library reference APP-098) identified at para 7.7.68 that Residential receptor Tan yr Allt is likely to have open views of the overhead line in close proximity. The Proposed Development may briefly skyline at this point since there would be some felling of the trees on this ridge however, the remaining woodland is likely to provide screening and minimise the extent of potential skylining.</p> <p>Table 7.22 of the ES identified the approximate distance from the property edge at the nearest edge of the LoD as being 107m, and the likely effects on residential visual amenity as being significant. Table 7.23 of the ES 'Mitigation Planting Within the Order Limits (to Alleviate Landscape and Visual Effects and to Alleviate Residential Visual Amenity Effects)' identifies mitigation planning in the vicinity of Tan yr Allt.</p> <p>The property at Bwlch is beyond 400m from the Proposed Development and no significant effects were identified.</p> <p>SP Manweb has further responded to the proximity and potential visual effects to Tan yr Allt in the following: SP Manweb has responded to the proximity and potential visual effects to Tan yr Allt and Bwlch in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 16 .6 'Impact on Residential visual amenity' of SP Manweb Response to Relevant Representations Document submitted at

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>contradicts SP Manweb's whole justification for promoting an O/H line. This seriously questions the claims made in the reports regarding the cost of undergrounding, the impartiality of the authors and credibility of SPM.</p> <p>(10) 5.23.5 states that decommissioning for underground cables which have no future need generally means the cables are left in situ. This would be far more economical and less intrusive and environmentally damaging than removing an O/H line. Has this been taken into consideration in the costing?</p> <p>(11) There has been a general lack of transparency on the cost comparisons for the O/H undergrounding. Whole life costing doesn't appear to be considered in the costs and in this case it is important especially decommissioning costs. There is far less decommissioning work for underground cables – as confirmed in SPMs Design and</p> <p>(12) It is stated in the Construction report that underground cables can be left in-situ whereas for O/H lines, the cables, steel frame and posts need to be dismantled and transported off site. This also means that accesses would need to be re-created thus adding to the decommissioning costs and environmental damage.</p> <p>(13) The reports indicate a 40 year life for the proposal although I understand that it could remain in place in</p>	<p>Deadline 1 (Examination library reference REP1-053)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP Manweb's response to the Ex A FWQ 1.4 (para 39) 'Principles of Development: Assessment Approach and Policy', and FWQs 8.5, 8.12 and 8.17 'Landscape and Visual Impact' (Examination library reference REP1-063) submitted at Deadline 1; • SP Manweb's responses to Llanrhaedr yng Nghinmeirch Community Council and Nerys Jones ((SP Manweb's Comments on Responses to First Written Questions submitted at Deadline 2) <p>(6) <i>As is standard practice, the detailed design of access arrangements has not been prepared. Rather, the locations have been identified, the majority of which are in a location where there is an existing gate in to the field, with Requirement 9 of the DCO providing that no works to construct or alter any permanent or temporary means of access to a highway must commence until the design and layout has been approved by the relevant highway authority. Therefore the final design of the access remains subject to the relevant highway authorities control.</i></p> <p>Please also refer to Appendix 21 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Deadline 4) (Examination library reference REP3-030)</p> <p>(7) The Examining Authority requested that clarity was provided in respect of the width of the access tracks required for the construction of the Proposed</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>perpetuity. If this is the case, the wooden poles would generally need to be replaced every 40 years. Accesses would need to be created in a similar manner to the current proposals. Essentially, the environment would never stabilise because every 30-40 years it would be disrupted by maintenance operations.</p> <p>(14) Hedges would grow then be removed to create accesses. Therefore to state in the environmental impact assessment that the environment and ecology would recover in time is not strictly correct given the maintenance operations required.</p> <p>In comparison, replacing underground cables would be far more cost effective as the old cables could be drawn from the ducts and replaced with new ones causing minimal disruption and negligible environmental damage.</p> <p>(15) Given the importance of maintenance and decommissioning costs, whole life costing is very important to consider when comparing the O/H and underground options – there is no evidence of this calculation in SPMs reports. Future year costs will obviously attract inflation and given the higher future costs for O/H lines, this will favour the undergrounding option for whole life costs.</p>	<p>Development. This was provided for Deadline 4, Please refer to DL4 Appendix 21 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case put at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 1 (Examination library reference REP4-024)</p> <p>8) The reasons SP Manweb is promoting a 132kV overhead line are contained within the Strategic Option Report document reference 7.3 and Lifetime Costs Report (Examination library reference REP4-024)</p> <p>9) Section 5.20.5 in the Design and Construction Report document (reference 7.1) states “Generally 132kV cable systems are maintenance free other than for noninvasive periodic electrical tests“. The details of these noninvasive periodic electrical tests are detailed in section 6 of the Lifetime Costs Report and SP Manweb has included the costs of this activity in the assessment of lifetime costs.</p> <p>10) Section 6, pages 30-32 of the Lifetime Costings Report (Examination library reference REP4-024) expands on the cost of decommissioning of an OHL and cable design that were taken into account in the assessment of lifetime costs.</p> <p>(11) This response is addressed in the costings paper submitted for DL4 “Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Examination library reference REP4-024)</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>12) This response is addressed in the costings paper submitted for DL4 "Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11 (Examination library reference REP4-024)</p> <p>13) Section 6 page 31 of the Costs Report (Examination library reference REP4-024) defines the likely timeline for asset replacement of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>(14) SP Manweb has sought powers through the draft DCO to create temporary accesses for the construction period and this will result in the removal of some hedgerows. This is considered at paragraph 6.7.21 of Chapter 6 of the ES (Examination Library Reference APP-097). Once the construction is complete, the hedgerows will be reinstated. There are only 8 areas where SP Manweb is seeking access rights for the life of the 132kV Overhead Line, 4 of which are existing accesses. The remaining 4 would have to be created whenever SP Manweb needed to utilise the right. Should SP Manweb require additional access over and above the 8 referred to above, then SP Manweb would seek to obtain access through agreement with the landowners at an appropriate location. SP Manweb also retains powers under the Electricity Act 1989 to gain access if necessary. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the hedges identified as being necessary to be removed for construction will then need to be removed every 40 years, as identified by Mr Jones.</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>15) This response is addressed in the costings paper submitted for DL4 “Action 9b on the Action Points List provided by the Examining Authority following Day One of the Issue Specific Hearings Costs Report Appendix 11. (Examination library reference REP4-024)</p>
<p>Peris G Jones</p>	<p><u>Human Rights</u></p> <p>The Human Rights Act states that persons are entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his/her possessions under Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. I've yet to be convinced that SPM have provided evidence to demonstrate this including what national public economic benefit the proposal would bring compared to the damage it will cause to individuals.</p>	<p>SP Manweb has fully considered the effect of its scheme on the human rights of persons affected by the Proposed Development. The following documentation is referred to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statement of Reasons (version 2), section 9 (Examination library reference OpB-004) 2. SP Manweb's response to relevant representations (Examination library reference REP1-053) 3. SP Manweb's response to first written questions (Q.11.11) set out in the Deadline 1 Submission Document (REP1-056) 4. SP Manweb's oral case put at the Compulsory Acquisition Hearings (Examination library reference REP3-035) <p>In summary, SP Manweb considers that that the inclusion in the DCO of powers of compulsory acquisition is proportionate and legitimate and is in accordance with national and European law.</p> <p>Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Convention protects the right of everyone to a peaceful enjoyment of possessions and provides that no one can be deprived of their possessions except in the public interest and subject to the relevant national and international laws and principles. Article 8 is the right to respect</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>for private and family life. The Proposed Development does not involve the acquisition of residential property and all landowners will be informed when works are taking place.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the DCO has the potential to infringe the rights of persons who hold interests in land within the Order Land under Article 1.</p> <p>However, such an infringement is authorised by law so long as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the statutory procedures for making the DCO are followed and there is a compelling case in the public interest for the inclusion of powers of compulsory acquisition in the DCO; and 2. the interference with the Convention right is proportionate. <p>SP Manweb considers that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The statutory procedures for making the DCO are being followed. 2. There is a compelling case in the public interest to include compulsory acquisition powers in the draft DCO (see paragraph 1.9.2 and section 9 of the Statement of Reasons). In particular, the public benefit would be served by the Proposed Development's, and that part of the underground cable from the Terminal Point to the highway at Groesffordd Marli, delivery of a critically important electrical connection from renewable electricity generated at Derwydd Bach, Clocaenog Forest and Brenig wind farms to the distribution network. The Proposed Development would therefore play a significant role in satisfying the

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>urgent need for new renewable electricity as recognised by the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy, EN-1 (NPS EN-1), section 3.4. Furthermore, paragraph 3.7.3 of NPS EN-1 states that "<i>It is important to note that new electricity network infrastructure projects, which will add to the reliability of the national energy supply, provide crucial national benefits which are shared by all users of the system</i>" (our emphasis).</p> <p>3. Without the proposed powers of compulsory acquisition in the DCO, the Proposed Development would be impeded and the overriding public interest would not be served.</p> <p>4. Accordingly, there would be no breach of Article 1 and Article 8 as the Proposed Development is in accordance with the law as the purpose for the acquisition and creation of rights over land, namely the need to distribute electricity which is in the national interest, is sufficient to justify the interference with the human rights of those affected and the interference is proportionate in scope. Thus, the infringement would be authorised.</p> <p>On balance, the significant public benefits outweigh the effects upon persons who own property within the Order Land. For the small number of third party landowners affected by the exercise of the DCO powers, compensation is payable in accordance with the Statutory Compensation Code.</p>
Pylon the Pressure	<p><u>Route Selection</u> PPG have questioned the selection of the proposed route</p>	<p>The approach to routeing and consideration of the alternatives has been presented in the response to Issue Specific Hearings Day 1 (ISH1) Action 6a</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
Group	alignment in the context of consultation responses. The statement made at the hearings, which stated that the density of population could have affected the reliability of the consultation responses. It is also questioned why the blue route was chosen an option given the known constraints. PPG have stated its inclusion means that there is predetermination. The Hafod route is also questioned in the context of the wider consultation process.	submitted at Deadline 4 (Examination library reference REP3-030).
Pylon the Pressure Group	<p><u>Socio-economic</u></p> <p>PPG have provided a list of businesses which they state have not been considered as part of the tourism survey</p>	<p>The business survey and the number of responses have been considered in the response at Deadline 4 (SPM NWWFC PHSDCC) to the submission by Denbighshire County Council at Deadline 3 (Examination library reference REP3-005).</p> <p>Please also refer to paragraph 6.1.2 of the Written Summary of SP Manweb's Oral Case at the Issue Specific Hearing Day 3 (Examination Library Reference REP3-036) relating to the validity of the business survey undertaken.</p>
Pylon the Pressure Group	<p><u>Design</u></p> <p>PPG state that the evidence put forward by SPM stating that a single pole design is not possible is contradicted by previous submissions made by SPM (reference if made to a conference in July 2011).</p>	<p>As stated in WR to Robin Barlow the HDWP is required to carry an earth wire as the Clocaenog substation requires a remote earth for safety.</p> <p>The slide in the presentation was for Trident line that did not require a separate overhead earth wire.</p>
Pylon the Pressure	<p><u>Undergrounding</u></p> <p>PPG contests SPMs view that the benefits to landscaping</p>	<p>1. Cost of Undergrounding (Life Time Cost report) (examination library REP4-024) has been prepared to provide a <u>complete</u> analysis of the</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
Group	and visual amenity of undergrounding the cable are not outweighed by economic, social and environmental impacts.	<p>cost comparison between HDWP OHL and underground cable options.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The analysis now includes NPV calculations 3. Verification of SP Manweb cost basis is provided. 4. PPG groups own assessments are subjective, qualitative and open to interpretation. This is the nature of assessments. 5. SP Manweb do not accept that its analysis is flawed. 6. SP Manweb are confident that its cost comparison figures are reasonable, accurate and fair.
Robin Barlow	<p><u>Routeing and Overhead Line Design</u></p> <p>Excerpts from Routing Consultation Document dated August 2015 in relation to Loch Urr Grid Connection: Phase A (Front Cover and pages 8 and 9), published by SP Energy Networks.</p> <p>Sets out SPT policy as being to find an OHL solution for all transmission connections "and only where there are exceptional constraints would underground cables be considered as a design alternative. Such constraints can be found in urban areas and in rural areas of the highest scenic and amenity value." The document goes on to state that the proposed design for the Loch Urr connection is a 132kV connection to be supported by the Trident wood pole design. Describes the Trident design specification, which it states is a UK Electricity Design Standard. The following</p>	<p>Please refer to paragraph 3.3.6 ISH September Oral Summary and Appendices in addition to Appendix 3 of ISH 29th September Oral Summary and Appendices submission at Deadline 3 (REP3-030).</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
	<p>text is highlighted in the document (along with the word "Trident" throughout):</p> <p>"The proposed wood pole will support three conductors (wires) in a horizontal flat formation as shown in Figure 3. In addition, there is an earth conductor suspended between the main conductors in order to provide lightning protection." Figure 3 shows photographs of the Trident design.</p>	
Simon P White	<p><u>Health Impacts</u></p> <p>Concerned about impact of the pylons on [unspecified] health issues.</p>	<p>SP Manweb has already provided detailed responses relating to the proposed development and health/electro-magnetic fields impacts. These are outlined in the responses to Relevant Representations Section 12 (Examination Library Reference REP1-053) and response to First Written Question 4.17 from the Examining Authority (Examination Library Reference REP1-056).</p>
Simon P White	<p><u>Property Prices</u></p> <p>Concerned about the impact of the Proposed Development on property prices.</p>	<p>SP Manweb has already provided a detailed response relating to the proposed development and concerns relating to its impact upon property prices. These are outlined in section 4.3 of the responses to Relevant Representations (Examination Library Reference REP1-053).</p>
Simon P White	<p><u>Mitigation Planting</u></p> <p>Although SP Manweb proposes planting to mitigate the effect of the pylons there is no guarantee they will be maintained and by who.</p>	<p>SP Manweb has reviewed and revised requirements 5 (landscaping), 6 (implementation and maintenance of landscaping) and 7 (reinstatement planting) of the draft DCO and submitted these amendments to the examination at deadline 3. The revised DCO (Examination library reference REP3-031) includes the revised drafting and the introduction at the beginning of the DCO explains how the requirements operate.</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		<p>It is noted that the draft requirements include maintenance obligations, on SP Manweb, both in relation to the landscape mitigation as well as the reinstatement planting. It is therefore clear that the landscaping and reinstatement planting will be maintained by SP Manweb and there is a clear mechanism to secure this. After the maintenance period, the obligation to maintain will fall to the relevant landowners and the costs of this obligation will form part of the compensation payments to be made by SP Manweb, either negotiated voluntarily through agreement or through a compensation claim submitted by the landowners.</p>
<p>Simon P White</p>	<p><u>Hunting Rights</u> Concerned that the Proposed Development would interfere with hunting rights.</p>	<p>It is not anticipated that the Part 3 rights held by Mr White will be permanently impacted or interfered with as a result of the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development. Should there be interference on a temporary basis, as a result of the construction of the proposed OHL or from the operation or future maintenance, then any associated claim for disturbance would be considered on a case by case basis. Compensation is then assessed and ultimately paid in accordance with the relevant compensation code practices.</p> <p>On 10 June 2015 Freedom (on behalf of SP Manweb) wrote to Mr White with regard to his interest in land to which the Proposed Development relates. The rights included rights of hunting, shooting and sporting. In the letter of 10 June, Freedom advised that SP Manweb does not anticipate that the Order will have any impact upon these rights, and invited Mr White to contact Freedom to discuss this further if he considered that the Order may interfere with his rights.</p> <p>SPM is in discussions with Mr White and a meeting has been arranged for 6th November, although SP Manweb does not anticipate that the Order will have</p>

Respondent	Written Representation	SP Manweb Response
		any impact upon these rights.
Simon P White	<u>Costs of Undergrounding</u> Concerned that the costs of undergrounding submitted by SP Manweb are not accurate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost of Undergrounding (Life Time Cost report) (examination library reference REP4-024) has been prepared to provide a <u>complete</u> analysis of the cost comparison between HDWP OHL and underground cable options. 2. The analysis now includes NPV calculations 3. Verification of SP Manweb cost basis is provided. <p>S P Manweb are confident that its cost comparison figures are reasonable, accurate and fair.</p>

Appendix 1: Table 1: Extract taken from Appendix 7.1: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (DCO Document Ref 6.20.1, examination library reference APP-132)

Ref	Property/ Group Name	Assessment	Sensitivity	Magnitude	Rationale and Summary
217a	Hafod – Planning permission for dwelling	<p>Hafod – Planning permission for a dwelling, but no design details available, so the assessment could not be completed. Approximate distance from centreline of the Limits of Deviation is 100m.</p> <p>Distance to nearest point on the edge of the Limits of Deviation is approx. 90m - this represents the worst case scenario in terms of potential nearest proximity to the Final Route Alignment.</p>	High	Unknown	No detailed design available for this proposed dwelling.