

Action Points from the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing in relation to the Compulsory Acquisition of rights and the imposition of restrictions over land in relation to Option A (the original application) which took place on Wednesday 9 December 2015.

Action Number 11

The Applicant and Mr Eifion Bibby of Davis Meade Property Consultants are to agree the details of plot and pole numbers for the following affected persons listed in the ExA's table of interested parties who are objecting to the CA of rights, and provide updated details to the Panel:-

- Line 2- Mrs CA Owen**
- Line 8 – Mr D G Davies**
- Line 12- Mrs J Lloyd Jones**
- Line 13 –Mr D C Jones**
- Line 14 – Mr A A Owen**
- Line 20- Mr EW Hughes, Mrs PA Hughes & Mr EW Hughes**

1.1 Second written question 11.1a stated as follows:

The Panel has prepared a schedule of Interested Parties and Affected Persons that have objected to the compulsory acquisition (CA) of rights over land in their representations. The Panel proposes to keep this schedule updated during the remainder of the Examination.

(a) Please could the Applicant, Interested Parties and Affected Persons and their agents and provide any changes or additions that they consider should be made to it (by tracked changes or provision of a note submitted by the 18 November); and

(b) please could the Applicant assist with populating the columns identifying land plots and pole numbers.

1.2 SP Manweb and Mr Eifion Bibby both submitted revised versions of the tables for Deadline 6 (Examination Library References REP6-036 and REP6-003 respectively). SP Manweb then reviewed the annotated table prepared by Mr Bibby in response to Second Written Question 11.1(a) and identified five discrepancies between the table produced by Mr Bibby and that produced by SP Manweb. This was submitted at Deadline 7 (REP7-005). Both parties have now met and discussed such discrepancies and reached agreement as to how the table should be drafted and finalised, as outlined below:

Row/Line Number and	Discrepancy Identified by SP Manweb submitted at Deadline 7	Eifion Bibby Comments on the applicants response to second round of written questions (Late Submission	Agreed Position
----------------------------	--	---	------------------------

Interest		Deadline 7), published on 9 December 2015	
Mr A A Owen and Mrs C A Owen (Lines 2 and 14)	Mr Bibby has added AA Owen as an Interested Party Name. As RR-071 only references CA Owen, it is SP Manweb's view that it is not necessary to insert such an interest into this row. AA Owen's interest is summarised in Row 14 of the table.	Duplication noted. However Mr AA Owen is a joint owner with Mrs CA Owen. To avoid duplications of correspondence when making original representations a Planning Inspector representative suggested using one name when multiple owners or tenants existed.	The parties have agreed that in the "Notes (for example if an objection is withdrawn)" column, to insert the following wording, "Mr AA Owen (see row 14) is a joint owner with Mrs CA Owen. To avoid duplication of representations, when making original representations the Planning Inspectorate case officer recommended utilising one name, where multiple names existed in a household. As such, whilst the relevant representation relates only to Mrs CA Owen, the representation expresses the views of Mr AA Owen".
Mr D G Davies (Line 8)	David Gwynfryn Davies does not have an interest in plot 12, which is where pole 26 is located. As such, it is SP Manweb's view that pole 26 should not be referenced next to this interest	From our interpretation of information received from Scottish Power we have considered that Plot 12 does apply to the subject interested party and pole 26 straddles our client and a neighbouring property owner's boundary.	The parties have agreed that in the "Notes (for example if an objection is withdrawn)" column, to insert the following wording, "On the Works Plans, whilst Pole 26 is extremely close to the boundary of Plot 12 (approximately two metres), it is not shown as being within Plot 12. It is however acknowledged that the structures are double wooden poles and they are in an indicative location within the Limits of Deviation. As such, depending on the final location of the structures one of the poles could be placed within Plot 12".
Mr D C Jones and AL Jones (Lines 12 and 13)	Mr Bibby has included DC Jones and AL Jones within Row 12. SP Manweb's view is that this is already included within Row 13 and it is not necessary to insert this into another Row, as all interests have already been reflected in the annotated table provided by SP	Relevant Representation 72 refers to JL Jones as interested party. However property owned jointly by the aforesaid and Messrs. DC & AL Jones. To avoid duplications of correspondence when making original representations a Planning Inspectorate representative	The parties have agreed that in the "Notes (for example if an objection is withdrawn)" column, to insert the following wording, "Messrs DC and AL Jones also own this property jointly with JL Jones (see row 13). To avoid duplication of representations, when making original representations the

	Manweb.	<p>suggested using one name when multiple tenants or owners existed.</p> <p>RR58 applies to a separate interest being a sole tenancy appertaining to Mr DC Jones.</p>	<p>Planning Inspectorate case officer recommended utilising one name, where multiple names existed in a household. As such, whilst the relevant representation relates only to JL Jones, the representation expresses the views of Messrs DC and AL Jones.</p> <p>Relevant representation numbered 58 relates to a separate sole tenancy interest in the name of Mr DC Jones".</p> <p>Relevant Representation 58 (Line 13) applies to a sole tenancy appertaining to Mr DC Jones".</p>
Mr A A Owen and Mrs C A Owen Lines 14 and 15)	Mr AA Owen has been included within this Row 15, however SP Manweb consider this interest is already fully documented in Row 14, as already explained. Furthermore, Mr Bibby lists pole 188 (plot 98), albeit this pole is not located within AEM Owen's land.	<p>(i) It transpires that poles 108 and 109 apply to a joint tenancy interest involving Messrs AA & AEM Owen. This is a separate tenancy to that applicable to plots 99 and 100.</p> <p>(ii) Mr AA Owen interest applicable to Line 14 applies to a distinct tenancy.</p> <p>(iii) The comment regarding Pole 188 is noted. However the stays appear to straddle the boundary into Plot 99.</p>	<p>The parties have agreed that in the "Notes (for example if an objection is withdrawn)" column, to insert the following wording:</p> <p>"Poles 108 and 109 relate to a joint tenancy interest involving Messrs AA & AEM Owen. This is a separate tenancy than that referenced in the Book of Reference at plots 99 and 100.</p> <p>Line 14 relates to a tenanted interest solely applicable to Mr AA Owen. On the Works Plans, whilst Pole 188 is extremely close to the boundary of Plot 99 (approximately five metres), it is not shown as being within Plot 99. It is however acknowledged that the structures are double wooden poles and they are in an indicative location within the Limits of Deviation. As such, depending on the final location of the structures one or</p>

			both of the poles (or stays) could be placed within Plot 99".
Mr EW Hughes, Mrs PA Hughes & Mr EW Hughes (Line 20)	Mr Bibby has written that poles 204-213 are those poles on the land of EW, PA and EW Hughes. SP Manweb considers that this is not correct; the Hughes do not have any interest in relation to these poles. Such poles listed do not match the plot numbers included by Mr Bibby	Mr Bibby has acknowledged that a misprint exists. The correct poles are confirmed as 103-107 & 111-112.	<p>The parties have agreed that in the "Notes (for example if an objection is withdrawn)" column, to insert the following wording:</p> <p>"On the Land Plans, whilst Pole 117 is extremely close to the boundary of Plot 56 (approximately 1.2 metres from the northern fence line and 4.8 metres from the western fence line), it is not shown as being within Plot 56. It is however acknowledged that the structures are double wooden poles and they are in an indicative location within the Limits of Deviation.</p> <p>SP Manweb, in its negotiations relating to voluntary agreements and compensation, has undertaken the exercise of seeking to identify where the full structure will be located. In the indicative plans provided to Mr Eifion Bibby as part of that negotiation exercise, it transpires that at least one of the two wooden poles and /or associated stays (applicable to Poles 117) may fall within plot 56".</p>

Response from Eifion Bibby of DMPC to Action Points 1 & 11 from the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing in relation to the Compulsory Acquisition of rights and the imposition of restrictions over land in relation to Option A (the original application) which took place on Wednesday 9 December 2015

Action Point 1 – To provide a written update on the discussions with regard to pole 119 -:

A site meeting was arranged for the Applicant's representatives to meet with Mr H Hughes (being a joint interested party) on Monday 14th December 2015 to discuss the potential location of angle pole 119 and associated stays so as to avoid interference with the existing access passage (together with the provision by Scottish Power of accommodation works involving a grazed track for health and safety purposes with the aim of preventing vehicles impacting into the proposed apparatus by sliding from the banked access "corridor" . We are informed that SP Manweb is now in the process of evaluating the implications of this work and will respond shortly .Furthermore we are awaiting updated drawings to confirm the proposed location of the intended apparatus (including angle pole 119 and stays) .

Action Point 11

Please see accompanying Joint Note . Moreover, in so far as we are aware the Plot Numbers in Table 1 (provided by the Applicant in SP Manweb's response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions) are correct .However we have not observed unregistered or registered legal title details to enable us to verify the extent of the subject properties. Furthermore discussions are ongoing on the intended siting of proposed poles & stays.