

From: Iwan Jones [REDACTED]  
Sent: 18 November 2015 11:07  
To: North Wales Wind Farm Connection  
Subject: Examiners second questions - Iwan Jones

0.2 (we accept that compared to most farmers in terms of pole locations we are lucky) However, we asked for the post to be placed as close as possible to the hedgerows. We were notified on the 4th November (some time after option B was published) that in our case it was not possible. Reasons given were that the span between 108 and 109 was shorter than the minimum allowed, there are however shorter spans on the route. It was also stated that moving pole 110 onto the boundary would exceed the maximum allowed span length, again this is strange given the span (approx 75mtrs) is less than the average span along the route. A number of other farmers have had similar reasons given.

#### 4.8 Use of goal posts/barriers.

Whilst using goalposts will be practically very hard to sustain, their use in an ideal world would probably mostly be at harvest time, such as loading trailers with loadalls, combining etc. A bigger problem for most farmers would not be the height of the cables but avoiding collision with posts and stays and especially when contractors are doing field work. This would be a greater risk on fields with slopes when tractor or machinery can skid, a barrier would not avoid this type of collision as the driver would have very little control. We will have one structure a few meters from a hedgerow, our tractor might fit between them but a contractor might not so to negate any risk we would have to put a barrier from the hedge to the posts that would stop anyone trying to fit between them, this would lead to a bigger affected area.

#### 8.1 The text in version 3 of the CEMP 3.3.2 is clearer.

'The reinstatement planting plan cannot include any new trees without the agreement of the land owner.'

I have however spoken to a number of landowners that have no idea what landscaping is going to happen on their land within the dark green and yellow/green areas -

'The requirement in the DCO provides that SP Manweb will prepare a written landscaping scheme (following consultation with affected landowners) prior to commencement of development which must be approved by the relevant planning authority'

This leaves landowners uncertain about the effect on their land and also what type of landscaping they will be responsible for maintaining post the initial 5 years.

12.2 As I and others have stated our view is that the strategy of the applicant is that the development in future would be part of the network and able to be used for either export or import of electricity. The new wording in my view confirms this and that this application is not just an application to connect three windfarms.

12.4 (I'm sorry if I've not understood the issue here properly) In my view those rights classed as temporary should be removed from this article. When I questioned the applicant in the hearing how access would be secured to the line for repair/renewal purposes given that these rights associated with the 'yellow land' finish after 5 years the applicant stated that they had the powers through the 1989 electricity act. Given that the applicant believes the act will give them the power to renew and maintain the line why does the applicant need to compulsorily acquire these rights through the DCO when they believe they already have the powers through the electricity act.

[REDACTED]

Iwan Jones

[REDACTED]