

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Brechfa Connection](#); [Stella Perrett](#); kathryn.king@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: 151202 EN020016 Karen Miles - Submission for the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on 2nd December 2015
Date: 02 December 2015 08:43:54

Dear Mr Broderick

Written representation on behalf of Mr HV & Mrs KI Miles, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] in lieu of representation at today's compulsory acquisition hearing

As a matter of courtesy, please accept my apologies as work commitments will not permit my attendance today, but I hope to attend tomorrow.

As a matter of record, however, we would like our 3 oral representations made at the Open Floor Hearing on 30th November and 1 December 2015 to be taken into account in the proceedings today.

In particular, like the vast majority of other representations made by landowners, we feel that Western Power Distribution (WPD) has undertaken a very tokenistic approach to consultation, and indeed, 'discussion' and any 'negotiation' with landowners has taken the form of a posted Heads of Terms (HoTs), which was only received on 14th November 2015, and which:

- does not provide with any certainty the 'exact' location of the poles and whether their alignment is fixed and final. In particular, there is no clarification on why the route is proceeding as 'broadly indicated' by WPD, given that the Bryn Llewellyn installation is now not taking place. On landowners reckoning the current indicated route is entirely the wrong one in light of Bryn Llewellyn not proceeding, zigzags far more than it ought with far more intrusive H-poles in play as a result, and, in our case causes a criss-cross of existing and proposed new lines
- contains many unresolved issues which WPD have made no attempt to discuss with us, and which leave us in a position where we cannot sign the HoTs, as we are waiving too many rights to do so e.g. there is a clause in the Heads of Terms that states that upon their signing, we will have to agree not to object to the application for a DCO and further will agree to a number of protective provisions and rights to WPD. As previously stated, this feels exceptionally pre-emptive, given you are still deliberating the application. At this stage we would not be able to participate in the fair process your role is trying to oversee – open floor hearings, compulsory acquisition hearings etc - which feels exceptionally poor procedurally
- Within the HoTs, there is no mention of how injurious affection will be dealt with which would allow us to make an informed decision; for ourselves, our property value will be significantly affected. Further, we have no assurance that in their signing, we are not leaving an open option to even worse intrusion in the future, namely, metal pylons and this lack of clarity at this stage is extremely concerning.

Last night, after the site visit, where it could be appreciated firsthand what an intrusion these

pole and lines will be, we made a further oral representation. The home and farm which we have designed and built ourselves is the culmination of 30 years effort, which has also embraced an even greater commitment to safeguarding the beauty of the valley for everyone's pleasure, whilst planning the house around maximising a 180 degree view of the exceptionally pretty landscape views of the valley. Whenever we have built agricultural buildings, we have cut into the valley side and stone-walled, so as to make them as unobtrusive and sympathetic to the landscape as we can, never allowing anything to dominate over the beauty of the valley itself. We have worked closely with the Environment Agency, double fencing along the River Gwili to create a haven for wildlife, fauna and flora.

The proposed poles and cables will cut through nearly every field of our farm, and this will be in addition to an existing line which already crosses our land. Early on an offer was made by WPD to bury these poles so why not bury the new ones as we've requested?

The proposed poles occupy our main silage fields. Indeed the H pole and its stays plus 1 single pole occupy probably our most productive silage field, and that is on top of 4 existing poles for the current line already in this field. The new line will cross the existing line, visually dominating the landscape with poles upon even bigger unsightly poles, and lines upon lines – an untenable thought. We are most concerned about the new pole and lines crossing what we and the neighbours all affectionately call the 'park field', as it has 5 broad oaks set in the middle of the field from top to bottom, which are hundreds of years old and are absolutely stunning. Poles will mar this beauty and that is nothing short of an absolute travesty.

Finally, whilst no-one truly 'owns' a beautiful view, some of us have the great privilege of being custodians in terms of their safeguarding their immense value to every generation and no-one person or company has a right to destroy. To this end, we continue to request that the route is completely reviewed, that overhead lines are fully eliminated, and further that compulsory acquisition is completely ruled out and that our beautiful landscape is protected, and this can be achieved by undergrounding which we would fully support and accommodate.

Yours faithfully

Howard and Karen Miles
Gwili Vale

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.