



Planning Inspectorate Reference No. EN020014

Document reference: SPM NWWFC ExA2 Appendices- 0.2 -

Table of Landowner Suggestions

Author: SP Manweb

**Second Round Written Questions - Appendix 0.2
Table of Landowner Suggestions**

Option B		
Q No.	Question to:	Question Subject Matter
0.2	The Applicant, Interested Parties, Affected Persons and their Land-agents	Please could the Applicant, Interested Parties and Affected Persons provide details of requests that were made to the applicant for the pole locations that were proposed in the original application (Option A) to be moved, where these requests could not be accommodated within Option B, and provide the reasons why these requests were made and why they could not be included in Option B.

Process Taken when Considering Landowner Suggestions

SP Manweb undertook the following steps in its assessment of suggestions made by landowners to make amendments to the Proposed Development:

1. Collation – As part of the compulsory acquisition process SP Manweb is required to seek to acquire the rights and restrictions it is seeking to acquire compulsorily by way of voluntary agreement. As part of this process it received suggested amendments to the Proposed Development, which would make it more acceptable to affected landowners. SP Manweb accepted suggestions in any format i.e. verbal, written e-mail / letter and annotated plans.
2. Technical Feasibility – each suggestion has been subject to a design feasibility check. This is to ascertain if the suggestion is technically feasible within the HDWP specification. Whilst each suggestion is checked on its own merits, careful consideration was given to the consequential impact on the Proposed Development as a whole.
3. Environmental Impact – If a suggestion is technically feasible, an assessment was then undertaken to determine if the change would result in an environmental effect which would result in increased adverse effects in comparison to Option A. If it did, then SP Manweb considered whether the environmental effects could be mitigated or were justified in light of other matters, such as effects on third parties.
4. Conclusions – Following the above steps a decision was taken in relation to each suggestion as to whether it would be taken forward into the Option B design. SP Manweb communicated with landowners (or their agents) whether or not their suggestions had been incorporated in to the Option B design. This was communicated in the time leading up to the submission of Option B in to the Examination. It was only possible to communicate this formally to landowners at that stage as SP Manweb had to retain a holistic view of the suggestions made before locking-down the Option B design.

Glossary of Terms

The following explanations are provided to give the Ex A an understanding of the terms used in this response.

angle of deviation – this is the angle that the line deviates from its previous direction. The maximum deviation allowed in the HDWP specification is 35 degrees.

failure containment structure - These structures are designed to resist loads generated by a single broken conductor in one span and shall be located at 2km intervals within the specification.

ground clearance – this is the clearance to ground of the conductor. Generally, this can be no less than 6.7m at any point along the Proposed Development as determined by ENA Technical Specification 43-8.

HDWP - Heavy Duty Wooden Pole

insulators – these electrically separate the conductor from the support structure. They are designed to withstand the system voltage as well as any mechanical forces (bending or pulling) placed upon them.

intermediate structure - These supports are not constructed to withstand the same force as section structures, serving mainly to support the power lines along straight sections. There is no scope within the HDWP specification to have angles and stays on intermediate supports

out of balance – To minimise the net resultant force exerted on a structure, the forces being applied to the structure by spans either side of the structure should be as closely matched as possible. The limits of this matching are set by the specification and are derived from the strength of the structure's components and the environment to which the structure will be placed.

section structure - The rigid and strong construction of the section poles is intended to withstand considerable stresses caused by tension in the lines. Section poles are installed at the beginning and end of a power line and at angles of deviation or where forces are too great for an intermediate structure

span length – this is the distance from one support to the next. The maximum and minimum span lengths are set by many variables and differ location to location. Examples of these variables are structure type, altitude, span weight, wind span, topography, ground usage, ground clearance etc.

specification – The approved HDWP technical guidance used by the SP Manweb Overhead Line Engineers to design the Proposed Development.

stays – these are steel wires that are attached to the top of the structure and anchored in the ground. They are used to oppose forces in angle poles and to provide failure containment.

uplift – This occurs when the weight span of a structure is negative (i.e. the structure is being pulled upwards)

wind/weight span – These are values that are calculated to inform selection of supporting structures and used to calculate the force applied to the structure due to a horizontal wind blowing on the conductors and the weight of the conductors respectively.

Table showing landowner suggestions that could not be accommodated in the line design for the 132 kV Overhead Line.

Note, Where a landowner's suggestion has been accepted in entirety, these have not been identified below (as the question only refers to those that have been rejected). However, where a landowner's suggestion contains a number of suggestions and some have been accepted and some have been rejected, all the landowner's suggestions have been recorded and then it is identified which of those suggestions have been accepted and which have been rejected rather than splitting out the suggestions made by the landowner.

Landowner Name	Pole(s) the Landowner has suggested to move	Pole(s) affected by suggestion	Summary of Suggestion	Outcome	Reasons for Refusal
Dewi Wyn Wilkinson	22	N/A	The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb would consider moving pole 22 to the edge of the steep valley, towards pole 23.	Rejected	<p>This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>Moving pole 22 as suggested would not be technically feasible because it would result in a span length of 85 metres. This would exceed the maximum allowable span length of 80 metres in this location.</p>
Eric Gwyn and Annie Edwards	32 - 37	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could:</p> <p>a) move poles 32-37 away from the property known as Y Bwthyn, Cefn Maen Uchaf, Saron;</p> <p>b) move pole 44 to avoid tree.</p>	<p>a) Rejected</p> <p>b) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds.</p> <p>The suggestion would move the alignment to the south east and the pole positions closer / adjacent to the boundary of semi natural woodland (designated a Local Wildlife Site). The suggestion would also require the removal of scattered trees currently retained. In addition, from mapping, it would appear that the suggestion would place the poles on, or in close proximity to, a spring line. Therefore, the suggestion would result in the additional loss of trees which would increase the ecological impacts. Further, the location of a pole on, or close to, a spring line would increase the impacts on groundwater. Given the increased impacts this suggestion has been rejected.</p> <p>b) This suggestion is refused on a combination of environmental and technical grounds.</p> <p>To accept this proposal would increase the amount of stay wires on poles in the section by 4 and result in felling the same number of trees.</p>

					<p>This suggestion would require an additional two angle poles and stays at pole 44 and pole 45 to navigate around and avoid the tree. This would increase the impact on agricultural practices due to the increased footprint of the angle poles and associated stays.</p> <p>The stays required on pole 44 would then require the tree to the west of the line to be removed. Pole 45 is currently a Failure Containment structure that would require relocation to an adjacent intermediate (un-stayed) structure (i.e. pole 47 or 42) increasing again the impact on agricultural practices.</p>
Berwyn Maelor Roberts	49, 50	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could:</p> <p>a) move angle pole 49 to boundary fence line; and b) reposition pole 50</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds.</p> <p>The suggestion would move the alignment closer to Tan-yr-Allt, which would increase the impacts on the residential amenity of the property. Given there is already a moderate significance of effect, this is not justified and warrants rejection of the proposal.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds. Potential realignment of poles 49 / 50 may affect scattered trees which are currently retained. The hedge adjacent to the road is an Important Hedge (Arch and Ecol) (already assessed). Tree removal along the lane may change the visual effects - the overhead line and poles would potentially be more visible. Therefore, the proposals would result in increased tree and important hedgerow loss, as well having the potential to increase the visual effects. As a consequence the environmental effects would be materially increased by this option and it was rejected for this reason.</p>
Iwan Thomas Jones	51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could:</p> <p>a) move the route alignment east 150m; b) move pole 51 to the boundary? c) move pole 57 to the boundary?</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected c) Accepted</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds.</p> <p>The poles are likely to skyline as they traverse this ridge. Currently the poles have been routed slightly on an oblique between the two blocks of trees, in order to minimise the potential visual effects. Should the poles be moved to the east, there will be nothing to obscure them as they traverse the ridge, and it is therefore likely they will be more visible as they skyline on the ridge. The proposal does not follow the natural grain of the landscape (current alignment sits well with the existing trees). Therefore, the suggestion has been rejected on the basis of increased landscape and visual impacts.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p>

					<p>The existing span length between poles 51 and 52 is at near the maximum permitted span length allowable limit.</p> <p>If pole 51 was to be moved towards the boundary then this would necessitate a 14 m increase in span length which would increase the span length beyond the maximum allowable limit in this location. This movement would also impact upon the load bearing capacities of poles 50 to 52 because the span lengths between these poles would be out of balance.</p> <p>c) N/A</p>
Helen Morris Parry	64, 69	64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could:</p> <p>a) Reposition angle pole 64 to boundary fence line; b) Reposition angle pole 69 to grazing field.</p>	<p>a) Partial acceptance b) Partial acceptance</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been partially accepted. This means that SP Manweb were unable to amend the design of the Proposed Development in the exact way in which the landowner requested. However, it has made amendments to the design of the Proposed Development to respond to the land owners request.</p> <p>SP Manweb has been able to move pole 64 south as close to the hedgerow as possible. However, SP Manweb is unable to move the pole closer to the boundary fence line as the stays would cross in to the adjacent field boundary.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been partially accepted. This means that SP Manweb were unable to amend the design of the Proposed Development in the exact way in which the landowner requested. However, it has made amendments to the design of the Proposed Development to respond to the land owner's request.</p> <p>SP Manweb has been able to move pole 69 to the corner of the field as far as possible. However it cannot move any further as the stays would encroach on the boundary.</p> <p>Further, if the pole was moved to the suggested location the angle of deviation of pole 69 would exceed the maximum of 35° (currently at 32°) allowed at this location.</p>

Marian Jones	66, 67	66	The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could: a) move pole 66 to the hedge line; b) move pole 67 to the hedge line.	a) Accepted b) Rejected	a) N/A b) This suggestion has been rejected on technical grounds. SP Manweb cannot move pole 67 to the hedgerow because this would result in an exceedance of the maximum allowable span length for pole 66 (which is 75 metres in this location). The span length is currently proposed to be 75 m and the proposed change would necessitate an additional 36m of span length.
Emlyn Davies (tenant)	77, 80, 82, 83	80	The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could: a) move pole 77 moved north – west to the hedge; b) move pole 80 north – west to the hedge; c) move poles 82 to the field boundary; d) move poles 83 to the field boundary;	a) Rejected b) Accepted c) Rejected d) Rejected	a) This suggestion has been rejected on environmental grounds. The relocation of pole 77 to the hedge would place the pole on top of a public footpath. b) N/A c) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds. If pole 82 was to be moved to the boundary, SP Manweb would exceed the maximum span length allowed at this location by 25m. Currently the span length is proposed to be 85m, which is the maximum span length at this location. d) Given that it is not feasible to move pole 82, it follows the suggested movement to pole 83 is also not feasible.
Janie Wynne Smith	90, 92, 94	90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96	The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb could: a) move pole 90 nearer to the hedge (discussed with Emrys Griffiths, Herd Manager); b) move pole 92 to the boundary (Discussed with Emrys Griffiths, Herd Manager); c) move pole 94 to the boundary (Discussed with Emrys Griffiths, Herd Manager);	a) Accepted b) Accepted c) Rejected	a) N/A b) N/A c) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds. At this location the maximum span is 85m. It is currently 80m and a further 15m would be required to move pole 94 to the proposed position.

Neville Hughes (tenant)	96, 97, 99, 101, 102	99	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked if SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) could move pole 101 to the hedge line; b) could move pole 99 to the hedge line; c) could move pole 97 to the hedge line; d) is aware that pole 96 may be situated in a drainage ditch; e) is aware that pole 102 appears to be situated in a gateway and that SP Manweb will need to move the gateway for the landowner.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Accepted c) Rejected d) Partial e) See response in adjacent cell</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>SP Manweb cannot move pole 101 due to the maximum span length restriction of 75m for this location. The span between pole 100 and pole 101 is currently 74m therefore there is only a possible movement of 1m allowed within the specification.</p> <p>b) N/A</p> <p>c) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>Pole 97 cannot move north to hedge line, because it is an angle pole, and this would result in stays crossing the hedge line in to the adjacent field. Also, the proposed position would leave the spans either side of pole 97 out of balance.</p> <p>d) This suggestion has been partially accepted.</p> <p>SP Manweb has confirmed it can move the pole away from the drainage ditch if required when micro-siting the pole position within the limits of deviation.</p> <p>e) SP Manweb has agreed to move the gateway if required. This can be accommodated within the limits of deviation.</p>
Emyr Wynne Hughes	112, 107	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move failure containment structure 112 to the Northwest corner of the field; b) to move pole 107 to the hedge line; c) to reduce the number of poles in the field 3 to 2; d) to underground the 11kV undercrossing so as to reduce impact on field; e) to change pole 112 to a standard H pole without stays.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected c) Rejected d) Accepted, subject to design and consents of the 11kV line e) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>It has not been possible to accommodate the changes suggested for pole 112 due to restrictions on uplift and insulator bending forces. This structure is also a failure containment structure which must be located every 2km along the route of the 132kV Overhead Line. SP Manweb has reviewed the design to see if it would be possible to remove the stays to create a standard H pole, however this is not possible due to safety factors. It is, however, possible to reposition the pole 7 m closer to pole 113 if this reduces the impact on Mr Hughes' agricultural practices. SP Manweb's representative has notified Mr Bibby of the changes that may be possible and is currently awaiting a response on this matter. If Mr Hughes would prefer this option SP Manweb is able to incorporate the change in to either Option A or B as it is within the limits of deviation.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>The span length between pole 106 and the proposed position of pole 107 would be 120m. The maximum span allowed is 85m in this</p>

					<p>location and is currently 83m.</p> <p>c) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>The relevant span lengths are near their allowable maximum span lengths within the specification and therefore reducing the number of pole supports would take the span lengths beyond that allowed within the specification. SP Manweb is therefore unable to reduce the number of poles in the field from 3 to 2.</p> <p>d) N/A</p> <p>e) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>This structure is a failure containment structure which as per the specification must be situated every 2km along the line.</p>
Dewi Clwyd Jones	88, 90, 108	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 108 north about 16m into the fenced strip of land;</p> <p>b) to move pole 88 3m east towards 87;</p> <p>c) to move pole 90 move east towards the hedge.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Accepted c) Accepted</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>This is due to the minimum allowable span of 50m within the specification. The proposed position of pole 108 would create a 36m span.</p> <p>b) N/A</p> <p>c) N/A</p>
Iwan Wynne Jones	109, 110	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 109 as near to the hedge as possible;</p> <p>b) to move pole 110 as near to the hedge as possible.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>If this change was accepted, the span between poles 108 and 109 would be less than 50m, where the minimum span allowed within the specification is 50m.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>If this change was accepted, the span between poles 109 and 110 would exceed the maximum span allowed of 85m in this location.</p>

Hefin Hughes	117, 119, 122	119	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 119 east to the other side of the fence in the adjacent field to facilitate access ; b) to move poles 122 and 123 closer to woodland; c) to confirm if stays on pole 117 interfere with gate and access.</p>	<p>a) Accepted b) Rejected c) See response in adjacent cell.</p>	<p>a) N/A</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds.</p> <p>SP Manweb is unable to re-align poles 120-123 within the Order Limits of Option B or Option A. If these suggestions were adopted, they would be likely to impact on the Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland at Coed Wern Ddu.</p> <p>The suggested change would be likely to cause ecological effects on a woodland that is not currently impacted and, due to the woodland losses, create significant visual and landscape impacts. In particular, the suggested changes would locate the poles closer to the woodland at Coed Wern Ddu. The closer proximity of the wood pole structures and the overhead line to the woodland could necessitate tree felling/losses due to the requisite topple distances/clearances which would raise concerns from ecological and landscape and visual landscape and visual environmental perspective.</p> <p>c) SP Manweb considers that should pole 117 interfere with the gate, SP Manweb would consider repositioning the gateway to a mutually convenient location. This can be accommodated within the limits of deviation.</p>
Hywel Meirion Jones	124, 127, 128, 129, 132	129, 127	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 124 north towards corner of field; b) to move pole 132 into the corner of the field; c) to move pole 129 to hedgerow ; d) to remove stays on FC structure 127; e) to remove stays off FC 128.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected c) Accepted d) Accepted (post Option B) e) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>SP Manweb has considered the realignment to the east of poles 124, 127 and 128. This change cannot be accommodated due to engineering constraints relating to the maximum angle of deviation allowable for this design of the 132kV Overhead Line at this location.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>SP Manweb has considered the realignment of pole 132 and it is considered that this change is not feasible because it would result in an increase in span length to pole 132 which would be 25m greater than the maximum allowable span length in this location.</p> <p>Further, the proposed position would necessitate site stays being situated in the ditch between pole 132 and the public highway.</p> <p>c) N/A</p> <p>d) N/A</p>

					<p>e) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds. However, there is possibility that pole 128 could be removed in its entirety. This can be done within the Limits of Deviation.</p> <p>SP Manweb has continued to review its OHL design and on the 26/10/2015 provided the landowner's agent, Mr Bibby, with a copy of a revised design that would remove pole 128 and reposition pole 129 on to the hedgerow. These changes are not shown in Option B however they are feasible within the proposed Option A or B Limit of Deviation.</p>
Conwy Country Borough Council (Gareth and Lowri Evans tenant)	139	139	The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb to reposition pole 139 to hedge	Partial	<p>This suggestion has been partially accepted.</p> <p>SP Manweb has moved pole 139 towards the hedge as far as is technically feasible. This is constrained by the minimum allowable span length in this location between poles 138 and 139 and the maximum allowable span length in this location between poles 139 and 140.</p>
David E Jones	143, 144, 145, 146	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 143 to the hedge line; b) to move pole 144 north; c) to move pole 145 north; d) to remove pole 146 altogether.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected c) Rejected d) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>The suggested location for pole 143 will result in a low ground clearance issue in span 142-143, contrary to ENA Technical Specification 43-8.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>The suggested location for pole 144 would result in an exceedance of the maximum allowable span length in this location by 30 metres.</p> <p>c) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>The maximum span length in this location between poles 145-146 is 100m.</p> <p>The span is currently 85m. The suggested location would necessitate a span length of 115m.</p> <p>d) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>The cumulative length of the three spans between poles 143 and 146 is 246m with an average span length of 82m. If SP Manweb removed a pole, as proposed, then the average span length would be 123m</p>

					which exceeds the maximum allowable span length.
Meilir Owain Jones	147, 148, 149, 150, 151	N/A	The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb to reposition poles 147-151	Rejected	<p>This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds.</p> <p>The proposed suggestion would potentially make poles 147-149 more visible from Hafod Farm. The suggestion would necessitate positioning three poles (147, 148 and 149) in closer proximity to each other and thus increase the visual effects. These poles are likely to be visible and skylined in nearby views from both the B road and neighbouring residential receptors.</p> <p>The suggestion has been rejected therefore due to greater environmental impacts.</p>
Dilys Roberts	158, 159	N/A	The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb to re-route the overhead line around back of Ty Celyn	Rejected	<p>This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds.</p> <p>Ty Celyn is between two routeing constraints, Hafod Dingle and Croen-llwm-mawr. The current alignment crosses Hafod Dingle at the narrowest point of the woodland. Routeing principles involve the use of straight lines and gradual curves avoiding the need as far as possible for steep angle changes. From Hafod Dingle, to go round the back of Ty Celyn would place the route in closer proximity to the property and Hafod Wood (possibly requiring the removal of trees from the edge of the woodland). It would also require a number of larger angle structures, which would be more visually prominent to bring the route back to Croen-llwm-mawr. The proposal would also place the alignment higher in the landscape and make it more visible to the wider area.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposal would increase the level of impacts in landscape terms and the residential amenity of Ty Celyn. This is not justifiable in EIA terms.</p>

John Mars Jones	168	N/A	The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb to move pole 168 west to move the section to other side of tree line.	Rejected	<p>This suggestion has been refused on environmental grounds. The suggested route further west of Berain would be at a more elevated position and would run closer to Tyddyn Bartley and to the settlement at Cefn Berain. The route has been purposefully routed lower in the landscape to limit the potential for visual effects on the wider landscape.</p> <p>In addition there is a change in the direction of the route as it passes a constrained section near Croen Llwm Mawr and Tyddyn Bartley. The suggestion would result in a greater change in direction and could necessitate the use of larger structures.. In addition, the suggestion would move the route closer to Ancient Woodland and would have direct impacts. The increased level of impact in landscape terms is not acceptable. Further, there is no justification for the removal of additional Ancient Woodland.</p>
Dafydd Richard Owen	179	179	The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb if angle pole 179 be located east towards pole 178 in to neighbouring woodland along existing route alignment.	Partially accepted	<p>This suggestion has been partially accepted.</p> <p>Within Option B, pole 179 has been moved to the boundary of the adjacent property (east by approximately 22m). SP Manweb cannot accommodate any further relocation of pole 179 within the Option B Order Limits due to technical constraints relating to the minimum allowable span length between new pole position 179 and the existing pole position 178.</p>
Cefn Estate	182, 184, 185, 186, 187	180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 182 north on to Hedge in the direction of 183; b) to move pole 184 to the next boundary in the direction of 185; c) move Poles and stays 185 north closer to the next boundary towards 186; d) move poles and stays 186 north closer to the next boundary towards 187; e) to remove pole 187?</p>	<p>a) Accepted b) Partial c) Partial d) Rejected e) Rejected</p>	<p>a) N/A</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been partially accepted.</p> <p>Pole 184 can move north to the boundary. However, SP Manweb has not made this change in Option B as the survey data and aerial photography suggests that the new pole position suggested would be located on an existing gateway.</p> <p>However, SP Manweb would be able to adopt the suggestion in relation to both Option A and B as it is within the limits of deviation. Once clarification is provided by either the landowner or their agent, SP Manweb will confirm the outcome of this.</p> <p>c) This suggestion has been partially accepted.</p> <p>If pole 184 is moved north to the boundary following the suggestion contained within point (b) above, it would be possible to reposition pole 185 further north towards pole 186 by approximately 15m along</p>

					<p>the route alignment and within the Order Limits for Option A and Option B. The proposed change to 185 is linked to the on-going negotiations regarding the relocation of pole 184 in point (b). To be clear, the changes to Poles 184 and 185 can be accommodated within the limits of deviation for both Option A and Option B.</p> <p>d) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the topography repositioning pole 186 to the boundary would introduce a low ground clearance issue. SP Manweb has therefore not adopted this change in either Option A or B.</p> <p>e) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>Pole 187 cannot be removed due to span length limitations. A span length of 136m would be required and the current design only allows for a maximum span length of 120m in this location.</p>
Arthur Elwy Morris Owen (tenant)	193, 196	N/A	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb:</p> <p>a) to move pole 193 further north so as to avoid impact on agricultural practices; b) to move pole 196 in quarry.</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Rejected</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>If the pole was to move to the north as suggested, this would introduce clearance infringements relating to overhead line clearances as contained within the specification due to the ditch/ravine located between poles 193 and 194.</p> <p>b) This suggestion has been refused on technical grounds.</p> <p>If pole 196 was moved due east, this would increase span lengths beyond specification limitations and also the pole and stays would need to be located in a quarry. This would create ground clearance infringements due to the relatively lower ground level of the quarry. As a result, the line would be less than 6.7m above ground in places.</p>
Cefn Estate (tenant by Aled Alun Owen)	217, 218	218	<p>The landowner/tenant farmer asked SP Manweb</p> <p>a) for the line be terminated at pole 217; or b) for pole 218 to be moved away from the hedge boundary as the land owner wants to work around the pole</p>	<p>a) Rejected b) Accepted</p>	<p>a) This suggestion has been refused due to the additional costs of undergrounding the 99m span between pole 217 and 218. This decision was made in conjunction with the second suggestion which SP Manweb was able to accept.</p> <p>b) N/A</p>