

Grŵp Pwysau ar y Peilonau

Pylon The Pressure Group

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
England
BS1 6PN
Email: enquiries@infrastructure.gsi.gov.uk

Email: [REDACTED]

30th September 2014

To: Planning Inspectorate

Complaint regarding the adequacy of the pre-application consultation by SPEN (North Wales Wind Farms Connection)

I write to you on behalf of the "Pylon the Pressure Group" which represents the interests of the affected communities of Saron, Peniel, Groes, Henllan, Cefn Berain, Llanefydd and Cefn Meiriadog. The Group represents the opinions of over 300 residents who attended public meetings at Llanefydd on the 7th May, Henllan on the 2nd June and Prion on the 20th June 2014.

We wish to lodge a formal complaint against SPEN's conduct of the pre-application consultation for the North Wales Wind Farms Connection as outlined in the Department for Communities and Local Government's Guidance on the pre-application process (paragraph 68).¹ We have communicated all the points listed below to SPEN, in accordance with this guideline, but have been unsatisfied with the responses received. Please accept this letter, therefore, as our formal complaint as set out in Paragraph 68.

Specifically, we contend that the pre-application consultation process: (i) failed to consult adequately, (ii) did not have due regard to consultees' responses to earlier stages of the consultation, (iii) lacked clarity on what was being consulted upon, (iv) contained misleading information, and (v) due process has not been followed. Consequently, we question the legitimacy of the pre-application consultation, as we believe it was flawed and therefore not valid.

1. Failure to consult adequately

Community consultation is described in a) the Planning Act 2008 (Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 47) which stipulates that applicants have a duty to consult local communities, b) SPEN's Statement of

1

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/49468/Planning_Act_2008_pre-applications.pdf

Community Consultation (paragraph 6.13) which notes its intention to consult “with people who live and work within, and otherwise use, this area”, and c) the minutes of a meeting with the Planning Inspectorate in October 2013, during which SPEN stated its “intention of involving tourists in the consultation”.² We present evidence that: (i) key routing decisions were not informed by any consultation process; (ii) the statutory consultation has not provided a reasonable choice of alternatives; and (iii) adequate consultation did not occur in stages 1, 2 or 3 (statutory) of the consultation.

- 1.1. There was no consultation on the primary routing options (i.e. the choice between connecting to Corwen, Brymbo, Connah’s Quay, Holywell, St Asaph, Dolgarrog, or Trawsfynydd). As noted in the Strategic Options Report³, all these are viable options. Moreover, SPEN noted (paragraph 7.6 of this report) that “the options [of Corwen, Brymbo, Connah’s Quay, Holywell and Trawsfynydd] will be reviewed and back-checked as the project progresses as part of SPEN’s iterative design process to confirm the evaluation is still correct”. There is no evidence in any subsequent documentation of this having taken place. Failure to consult with stakeholders at this highest level decision is a serious flaw of the pre-consultation process.
- 1.2. Other than the two alternative routes near Henllan (see paragraphs 2.2 of this complaint), the statutory (stage 3) consultation feedback form does not present any choices to consult upon. Presenting a consultation which effectively offers no choice, contravenes the *Gunning* principles on public consultation, in that the consultation was too restrictive⁴.
- 1.3. A large number of residents did not receive any correspondence from SPEN regarding the proposed Clocaenog to St Asaph 132kV connection (for stages 1, 2 or 3 of the consultation process). This includes landowners on whose land the pylons will be placed (e.g. Tan yr Allt, Peniel and Myfoniog, Llanefydd). The results of a detailed survey of Saron, Peniel and Cefn Meiriadog residents are enclosed in the appendix. We have anecdotal evidence that the same non-consultation rate applies to other properties along the proposed route.
- 1.4. We are aware of two major caravan parks affected by the proposed route not having been consulted (Bryn Glas Caravan Park and Caer Mynydd, Saron).

2. SPEN did not regard relevant responses to publicity and consultation

The Planning Act 2008 (Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 49) requires applicants to “have regard to any relevant responses”. This point was emphasised to SPEN by the Planning Inspectorate who “reminded SPEN of ... the duty to take account of relevant responses (s49)”.⁵ The Planning Act

² http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020014/Enquiries/28-02-2014%20-%20Claire%20Duffy%20-%20Enquiry%202322787/131025_EN020014_North%20Wales%20Wind%20Farms%20Connection%20Meeting%20Note.pdf

³ <http://www.nwindfarmsconnection.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/4-2-Adroddiad-Dewisiadau-Strategol-Strategic-Options-Report.pdf>

⁴ see *The Vale of Glamorgan v. The Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice* [2011] EWHC 1532 (Admin) at [25]

⁵ http://infrastructure.planningportal.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN020014/Enquiries/21-06-2012%20-%20Claire%20Duffy%20-%20Enquiry%201289722/120419_EN020008_12_14%20SP%20Energy%20Networks%20Meeting.pdf

defines ‘relevant responses’ in the context of *individual* responses. We have evidence that SPEN (i) did not regard relevant responses to stage 1 and stage 2 of the consultation (paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 of this complaint), (ii) did not analyse responses appropriately thereby providing misleading strength of preference favouring / opposing route options (paragraphs 2.3 to 2.5), and (iii) intends not to consider individual responses to the statutory stage 3 of the consultation (paragraph 2.6).

- 2.1. Following Stage 1 of the consultation and according to SPEN's figures, a clear majority of respondents favoured the Blue route (66% of respondents who chose a first preference, picked the Blue route). The corresponding percentages for the red and green routes were 23% and 11%, respectively, meaning that the Green route was the least likely to be selected as respondents' preferred option (Page 10, Interim Consultation Report⁶). Yet despite this, the north section of the Green route was selected as the ‘Preferred Route Corridor’ for stages 2 and 3 of the consultation.
- 2.2. The ‘Hafod route’ appeared (for the first time) in SPEN’s stage 3 (statutory) consultation, and presented as SPEN’s preferred option. This was despite the Hafod route being based on feedback given by just 3 consultees in stage 2 of the consultation (pages 112, 122 Interim Consultation Report). This compares with 14 respondents to stage 1 of the consultation who gave the ‘Green corridor’ their first preference, 29 respondents who preferred the ‘Red corridor’ and the 85 respondents who preferred the ‘Blue corridor’.
- 2.3. In relation to responses to stage 1 consultation, paragraph 5.10 of the Route Corridor Report,⁷ notes: “The feedback response resulted in most respondents (72%) giving the Blue corridor as the most preferred corridor. Although the Green corridor was only first preference for 13% of respondents it was second preference for 69%. The Red corridor was first preference for 28% of respondents but least preferred for 57% of respondents, suggesting Blue corridor was preferred over Green, which was preferred over Red.” However, SPEN’s calculation of percentage preference is flawed, and the resulting interpretation is misleading. The table below gives the results of the 167 responses to stage 1 consultation:

	Red	Green	Blue	No vote
First	29	14	85	39
Second	16	76	8	67
Third	59	20	25	63
No vote	63	57	49	

- 2.4. SPEN’s 72% for Blue is calculated as $(100\% \times 85)/(85 + 8 + 25)$ which, correctly interpreted, is the percentage of respondents who indicated a first preference for the Blue corridor, in relation to all respondents who indicated any preference for the Blue corridor. This is completely different from SPEN’s interpretation of “most respondents giving the Blue corridor as the most preferred corridor” (and the same logic applies for the other corridors). To analyse the data correctly, there has to be consideration of the ‘no votes’,

⁶ <http://www.nwindfarmsconnection.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/4-1-Adroddiad-Ymgynghori-Interim-Interim-Consultation-Report.pdf>

⁷ <http://www.nwindfarmsconnection.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Adroddiad-Coridorau-Llwybrau-Route-Corridor-Report.pdf>

which SPEN interpreted as follows: “The likely reason for ... answers being left blank is that respondents were hesitant to mark a route they opposed as a ‘third preference’ as it could be interpreted as accepting the suitability of the route.” The denominator for any calculation must therefore be 167, the total number of respondents, including these ‘no votes’. The correct calculation for the percentage of respondents who indicated a corridor as a first preference in relation to the total number of responses e.g. for Blue: $(100\% \times 85)/167$ is:

	Red	Green	Blue
First	17%	8%	51%
Second	10%	46%	5%
Third	35%	12%	15%
No vote	38%	34%	29%

- 2.5. The correct interpretation of these data is: (i) There remains a clear first preference for the Blue corridor. More people selected a first preference for Blue than did not; (ii) SPEN has inflated the apparent second preference for Green. SPEN’s 69% is 23 percentage points higher than the true value of 46%. This is misleading. (iii) SPEN has inflated the third place preference for the Red corridor. SPEN’s 57% is 22 percentage points higher than the true value of 35%. This is also misleading. (iv) For an unbiased assessment of the least preferred option among Red and Green, the correct comparison is 38% (63 no votes for Red) versus 34% (57 no votes for Green). This acknowledges a no vote as being a rejection of the corridor, as stated by SPEN. Using a standard statistical test for proportions, this comparison is not statistically significant at $p=0.50$, meaning that it is incorrect to exclude the possibility of there being no difference in respect to those who placed a no vote against either the Red or Green corridor options.
- 2.6. SPEN has informed the owner of Bryn Glas caravan park that his collection of tourists’ comments and concerns, submitted to inform stage 3 consultation, would be considered as a single consultee response and not as multiple individual responses. This contravenes the Planning Act 2008 (Part 5, Chapter 2, Section 49) requirement to consider responses individually.
- 2.7. During an SPEN-organised presentation at Saron on the 20th June 2013, it was suggested by a member of the public that the existing underground ducting from Tir Mostyn may be a workable option for undergrounding the 132kV cabling. This was a relevant consultation response which SPEN dismissed out of hand without having investigated the options (as confirmed by SPEN at a public meeting in Llanefydd on 19th April 2014).

3. Lack of clarity on what was consulted on

The Government’s guidance on pre-application consultation⁸ states in paragraph 38 that: “Applicants must set out clearly what is being consulted on. They must be careful to make it clear to

8

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/49468/Planning_Act_2008_pre-applications.pdf

local communities what is settled and why, and what remains to be decided, so that expectations of local communities are properly managed.” We present evidence that SPEN failed to make clear what was being consulted on.

- 3.1. Key questions in stages 1 and 2 of the consultation process asked respondents to provide their views on potential routes *within* proposed corridors: Stage 1: “*Specifically* the feedback that we are requesting at this stage of our consultation is on three 132kV broad route corridors from Clocaenog Forest to St Asaph substation – Red, Green, Blue”. The question that followed was: “*Within* the Green/Red/Blue broad route corridor, are there areas that we should try and avoid placing the connection?” (Interim Consultation Report pages 156 and 158). Stage 2: “we are asking for your local knowledge and your views on where the route could be located *within* the preferred route corridor” (Interim Consultation Report page 181). At no point were consultees asked to comment or suggest alternative routes outside these corridors; yet in selecting the Hafod route as their preferred route choice (paragraph 16.1.18 of the Preliminary Environment Information Report⁹), SPEN accepted and placed the highest importance on a route which was outside the scope of stages 1 and 2 of the consultation.
- 3.2. The re-colouring of different sections of the routes during the various stages of the pre-application consultation misled consultees and contravened the requirement for clarity in how consultation reports are communicated. By way of examples: (i) Sections in the Peniel and Saron areas, originally coloured blue in stage 1, were re-coloured as green in stages 2 and 3. (ii) The Hafod route was coloured green in stage 3 while not being in either the red, green or blue route corridors in stages 1 and 2.
- 3.3. The outcome of stage 1 of the consultation process was that “the Blue corridor was selected in the southern half of the route, which then includes the Link corridor to connect the Green corridor in the north” (Interim Consultation Report page 169). According to SPEN’s description, therefore, any route alignment within the red/green section of the southern half of the preferred route corridor (which is neither the blue nor the Link corridors) should not be included in the Green corridor presented at stage 2. This inconsistency left a section to the south-east of Groes (containing properties Bodeiliog Uchaf, Bryn Amlwg and Bâch) that appeared in stage 3 (as green) but were not within scope for inclusion.
- 3.4. Cefn Maen Uchaf and Plas Cefn Maen (Cefn y Marial) are attached houses in Saron. SPEN incorrectly placed these properties on different coloured routes (page 20 of the Interim Consultation Report). They are attached houses and should have been part of the blue route (stage 1 consultation), or the green route (stage 2 consultation).

4. Misleading representations of the proposed routes

There are numerous instances of inaccuracies and misleading representations in SPEN literature supporting stages 1, 2 and 3 consultation.

⁹ <http://www.nwwindfarmsconnection.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/2-1-PIER.pdf>

- 4.1. The viewpoint pictures generated by SPEN have been extremely misleading to the wider audience, including those charged with approving the project. They appear to have been taken from strategic viewpoints: (i) not viewed from the perspective of people's homes, (ii) far away from the proposed line, (iii) avoiding places where the route runs over the skyline, (iv) conveniently placing pylons behind obstacles such as trees, (v) placed outside the proposed route alignment.
- 4.2. Not all illustrative views correspond with the wireframes. Notably the viewpoint from the B4501 on the northern approach to Peniel (page 4 viewpoint 3-6). There are 21 double wooden pylons on the wireframe compared to 15 on the corresponding illustrative view. There are also inconsistencies in the gradient of the stays between the illustrative views and the wireframes, which is misleading. For example, in the viewpoint referred to above, the stays in the illustrative photograph appear much less obtrusive than those in the wireframe photograph which downplays their true impact. There are also misleading photographs which attempt to downplay the impact of the poles on the skyline. For example the viewpoint from Saron village looking toward Foel Gasyth (page 2, viewpoints 3-6) where the wireframe shows the poles with a topography background thus lessening their impact on the skyline. However in the illustrative photograph the poles in this section clearly show that they will be crossing a ridge.
- 4.3. The pylons within the viewpoint from the B4051 Junction near Bron Haul (looking south) were placed outside the proposed route alignment. Only after complaints from the public did SPEN revise this particular viewpoint picture and send to some residents. However not all households on this affected section of the proposed route alignment received the revised viewpoint photographs
- 4.4. There are several misleading descriptions contained in the various reports, including: (i) in the vicinity of Saron and Peniel where SPEN state: "As the route reaches the ridge, it will briefly sky-line, but this alignment utilises screening provided by existing blocks of deciduous and coniferous woodland located on the northern flank of the ridge." (Interim consultation report. Page 30, paragraph 4); however, SPEN's Plans and viewpoints (3-6 page 2) clearly show their intention to plough through the woodland.
- 4.5. Failure to refer, by name and in any document, residential properties that are as close as 25m of the proposed route, such as Tan yr Allt, Peniel.
- 4.6. SPEN's Route Corridor Report of May 2013, Figure 4.4 (p.21) shows Landscape Sensitivity based on LANDMAP information. In it, the route within Denbighshire from the River Elwy to the proposed terminal pole near Groesffordd Farm, Groesffordd Marli, is shown as 'Medium-High'. However in Figure 4.8 'Field based Landscape Sensitivity' (p.30), it is downgraded two whole categories to 'Medium-Low'. No explanation is given for the downgrading other than the general information in the Report about landscape architects going out into the field to make assessments, as compared with the desk-based analyses using LANDMAP.
- 4.7. The Preliminary Environmental Report (page 31, table 8b) states that "The route passes through grazing land adjacent to wooded copses, then through a low and localised stream valley, before rising up again as it crosses the B4501 above Plas Captain. There are scattered properties within a few hundred meters of the route." This gives the impression that the 'scattered properties' are a few hundred metres away, whereas in fact they are no more than 156m away at the closest point. Using the word "within" allows SPEN to be technically

correct but is unprincipled to say the least. Page 33 of the same report further states “Views from properties close to College Farm are contained within the lower reaches of the localised valley” - the bungalow at College Farm actually lies within 156m of the route and the house at Hendy College lies within 189m. The bungalow will have open direct principal views of the route at 156m distance, skylining at 180m.

- 4.8. In the vicinity of Plas Newydd, a Grade II* listed building of national architectural importance, the only visual provided is from the public footpath near Plas Hafod (Page 11 of the Viewpoints document), which is entirely unrepresentative being at the foot of a wood, totally unpopulated, and some 100 metres south and 12 metres below Plas Newydd, which is by far the most elevated property in the area. The significance of the dramatic impact of the planned pylons viewed from Plas Newydd is being deliberately relegated despite its undisputed prominence and being designated as a Visual Receptor.
- 4.9. The visual impact on residences in Cefn Meriadog and by the general public is confirmed by the statement that “all properties will experience glimpses and or views of the route” even though glimpses are a gross understatement. The planned pylons will be intimately close to Plas Hafod, Maes, Tyn y Ffordd and highly visible to Plas Newydd. From the Cefn Meiriadog perspective to all the properties along the road from Plas Newydd to Tan y Graig (including Tyn y Coed, Plas Hafod, Maes and Tyn y Ffordd) the pylons traverse and skyline open landscape from Berain down to the river and from Berain (another Grade II* listed building) / Bodysgawen / Llanefydd they will be viewed rising up the northern slope of the Elwy and skylining over the ridge to the St Asaph substation.

5. Due process has not been followed

We have identified a number of instances where SPEN has (i) contravened important principles of public consultation, (ii) deviated from its own stated methodology (as described in the Route Corridor Report), and (iii) trespassed on private land.

- 5.1. As all the reasons for deciding against the north section of the Blue route (page 23, Interim Consultation Report) were known before stage 1 of the consultation (namely, Denbigh golf club, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, areas of settlement, Denbigh castle, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Welsh Historic Landscapes), it must follow that a decision had already been made; that is, it was *pre-determined*. This contravenes one of the *Gunning* Principles that public consultations must be undertaken *before* a decision has been made.
- 5.2. SPEN’s “Approach & Routeing Principals (sic)” emphasised the iterative nature of the process adopted and the steps taken to inform the choice of the “Preferred route option”. However, by introducing the Hafod route for the first time in stage 3 (statutory) consultation, SPEN has contravened its own Routeing Methodology as described in the Route Corridor Report, May 2013. The iterative process, also stipulated in paragraph 52 of the Guidance on the pre-application process¹⁰, had clearly not been followed. Similarly, the

10

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/49468/Planning_Act_2008_pre-applications.pdf

section to the south-east of Groes (see paragraph 3.3) had not been considered appropriately in presenting the route for stage 3 of the consultation.

- 5.3. Introducing the Hafod route in stage 3 (statutory) consultation, having already dismissed the red and blue routes, will result in a biased outcome to stage 3 of the consultation, as responses might have been very different had the red and blue routes been retained for fair comparison of all 4 routes (including also the green route). Paragraph 56 of the Government's guidance on the pre-application process states: "Where a proposed application changes to such a large degree that the proposals could be considered a new application, the legitimacy of the consultation already carried out could be questioned."
- 5.4. The fact that so many residents along sections of the proposed route did not receive consultation forms (as noted in paragraph 1.3, above) will have unfairly biased the outcome against these areas.
- 5.5. SPEN has implemented Schedule 4 of the Electricity Act in order to request access to land. Paragraph 10 of this Act requires a statutory notice to be served on the relevant person giving at least 14 days' notice of access to land for survey being taken. We are aware of a number of occasions where SPEN and their contracted representatives have accessed private land without prior serving of a notice. Examples include properties at Cefn Maen, Saron and Cefn Maen Isaf, Saron and land near Henllan owned by Coed Accas, Nantglyn.

I trust that the Planning Inspectorate will investigate this complaint thoroughly, and notify the Secretary of State of the errors, misrepresentations, flaws and questionable legitimacy of SPEN's pre-application consultation in relation to the North Wales Wind Farms Connection.

Yours sincerely,

Dyfrig Hughes (chair)

on behalf of members of the Pylon the Pressure Group: Iona Edwards-Jones (deputy chair), Fiona Dupays (secretary), Mr Jones, Gwyneth Griffiths, Iwan Jones, Dan Tyrer, Councillor Sue Lloyd-Williams, Roberta Owain Ashbrook, Sue Ellis, John Owens, Margaret Parry-Jones, Gareth Hughes, Steve Clarke, Councillor Meirick Lloyd Davies, Julie Roberts, Andy Horan, Arwyn Roberts, Eleri Wynne, Durand Hotham, Chris Brown, Kath Mitchell-Dawson, Steve Brown, Jill Tyrer, Jill Evans, Marian Hughes, Mair Rogers, Emyr Jones, Mark Davies, Ron Smith, Wyn Rogers, Laura Ellis Williams, Dewi Parry, Mari Jones, Steven Tasker, Paul Taylor, Simon White, John Jones, Iola Wilkinson, Beryl & Mervyn Wynne, TG Davies, Helen Jones, Janet Beedles.

Appendix: List of properties receiving consultation forms ('x' indicates forms not received)

House Name	Village	Postcode	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Abergliniau	Peniel	LL16 4TD			
Bryn Awel	Peniel	LL16 4TF	✓	x	X
Bryn Hyfryd	Peniel	LL16 4TF			
Ffolt	Peniel	LL16 4TE	✓	x	✓
Foel Glap	Peniel	LL16 4TF			
Garnedd Isa	Peniel	LL16 4TD			
Glasfryn	Peniel	LL16 4TN	✓	x	x
Gwyndy	Peniel	LL16 4TW			
Ty Fry	Peniel	LL16 4TW			
Ty Fry Isa	Peniel	LL16 4TW	✓	✓	✓
Cefn Farm	Saron	LL16 4TG	x	x	x
Hazelwood	Saron	LL16 4TG	x	✓	x
Yr Hen Ysgubor at Cefn Farm	Saron	LL16 4TG			
Accar Las	Saron	LL16 4SN			
Bro Dawel	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Bryn Bach	Saron	LL16 4SW	x	x	x
Bryn Bella	Saron	LL16 4TL	?	✓	?
Bryn Glas	Saron	LL16 4 TH	✓	x	✓
Bryn Golau	Saron	LL16 4 TH	✓	✓	✓
Bryn Golau Bungalow	Saron	LL16 4 TH			
Bryn Grugor	Saron	LL16 4SN			
Bryn Ocyn	Saron	LL16 4SR			
Bryn Tirion	Saron	LL16 4SW	x	x	x
Bwlch Y Gynog	Saron	LL16 4SW			
Caermynydd	Saron	LL16 4TL	x	x	x
Cefn Maen	Saron	LL16 4 TH	x	x	x
Cefn Maen Isaf	Saron	LL16 4 TH	x	x	✓
Cefn Maen Uchaf	Saron	LL16 4 TH	✓	✓	✓
Cefn Y Marial	Saron	LL16 4 TH	✓	x	✓
Drws Y Buddel	Saron	LL16 4SP	✓	x	x
Erw Las	Saron	LL16 4TL	x	x	x
Ffordd Las	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Hafodty Ddu	Saron	LL16 4SP			
Hafoty Goch	Saron	LL16 4SN	✓	✓	x
Isfryn	Saron	LL16 4SW			
Lyndav	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Maes Yr Eithin	Saron	LL16 4TL		x	
Meifod	Saron	LL16 4SW	x	x	x
Pant Y Foel	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Pen Y Ffridd	Saron	LL16 4SW			
Pen-Y-Ffrith Bungalow	Saron	LL16 4SW			
Penycaeau Bach	Saron	LL16 4TL			

Penycaeau Mawr	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Plas Meifod	Saron	LL16 4SW	x	x	x
Rhiw Goch	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Rhiwlas Ganol	Saron	LL16 4SN			
Rhiwlas Ucha	Saron	LL16 4SN	?	?	?
Tan Y Foel	Saron	LL16 4SW			
Tegfan	Saron	LL16 4SW	?	?	?
Ty Capel	Saron	LL16 4TL	x	x	x
Ty`n-Y-Ffrith	Saron	LL16 4TL	✓	x	?
Yr Hen Dy Ty`n-y-Ffrith	Saron	LL16 4TL			
Y Boced	Saron	LL16 4SR	x	x	x
Y Bwthyn,Cefn Maen Uchaf	Saron	LL16 4 TH	✓	✓	✓
1 Maes Yr Yrfa	Saron	LL16 4TL	x	x	x
2 Maes Yr Yrfa	Saron	LL16 4TL	x	x	x
3 Maes Yr Yrfa	Saron	LL16 4TL	x	x	x
Llys Aeron	4 Maes Yr Yrfa	Dinbych/Denbigh	x	x	x
Bron Haul	Peniel	LL16 4TN	✓	x	x
Bryn Y Dyffryn	Peniel	LL16 4TN	✓	x	x
Cae Glas	Peniel	LL16 4TS			
Cartrefle	Peniel	LL16 4TD			
College Farm	Peniel	LL16 4TT	x	x	✓
Foel	Peniel	LL16 4TE	✓	x	x
Fronheulog	Peniel	LL16 4TN	✓	x	x
Garnedd Ucha	Peniel	LL16 4TD		x	
Hendy College	Peniel	LL16 4TT		x	
Llys Awel	Peniel	LL16 4TD	✓	x	x
1 Maes Garnedd	Peniel	LL16 4TD	✓	x	✓
2 Maes Garnedd	Peniel	LL16 4TD			
Nant Aber Oer	Peniel	LL16 4TS	x	x	x
Pen-Y-Gerddi	Peniel	LL16 4TT	✓	x	✓
Rhewl Fach	Peniel	LL16 4TS			
Rhewl Valley	Peniel	LL16 4TS			
Tan Yr Allt	Peniel	LL16 4TN	✓	x	✓
Plas Captain			✓	x	✓
Bwlch					✓
Gwynfa	Saron			x	
Delfryn	Saron		x	x	x
Hyfrydle	Saron		X	x	x
Ty Tawel				x	
Capel Penrhos			X	x	x
Groes Bach			✓	✓	✓
Bodeiliog Isaf			✓	✓	✓
Coed Accas			✓	✓	✓
Pentre Cottage	Saron		✓	x	
Ffordd Fawr			✓	✓	✓

Plas Newydd Bach	Cefn Meiriadog		x		
Plas Newydd	Cefn Meiriadog		x		
Plas Hafod	Cefn Meiriadog		x		
Maes	Cefn Meiriadog		x		
Tyn y Ffordd	Cefn Meiriadog		x		
Tyn y Coed	Cefn Meiriadog		x		
Myfoniog	Llanefydd				x

Note: Properties with neither a tick nor a cross are yet to be approached.