

## **Brechfa Forest Connection**

Development Consent Order Application - Reference EN020016

# **Agreed notes from landowner meeting on Friday, 4 March 2016 to discuss alternative alignment and access options**

March 2016

## Brechfa Forest Connection Project - Meeting note

**Date:** Friday 4 March 2016

**Venue:** Pen-y-Waun, Alltwalis

**Attendees:** Iwan Jones (IJ), Diana Reader (DR), Bryan Davies (BD), Geraint Griffith (GG), Nick Buxton (NB), David Kenyon (DK), Jason Pacey (JP)

**Purpose of meeting:** To discuss pole positions, alternative access and an alternative alignment of poles 152 to 155.

### Summary of discussions

1. IJ opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.
2. IJ raised the question of professional fees for attending the meeting. NB explained that a response from WPD is being drafted and will be issued shortly. NB reminded IJ that he was instructed by his clients but that there is an agent's fee policy that outlines when fees are paid and when it is appropriate to pay additional fees. IJ agreed to stay and participate even though no confirmation regarding payment had been received.
3. IJ raised the point that one of his other clients was still awaiting the agreed payment for a survey which took place on their land. NB advised that Freedom were processing payments. DR asked which surveys were receiving payments, what survey payments would be made for surveys carried out on her land and requested that payments should be made fairly to all Landowners. NB advised that Freedom were already undertaking an audit of surveys and payments made as they were dealing with this aspect of the project. Any further monies due would be forwarded in due course.
4. DR asked what survey payments she would get for surveys carried out on her land. NB advised that Freedom were already undertaking an audit of surveys and payments made as they were dealing with this aspect of the project. Any further monies due would be forwarded in due course.
5. BD asked if he would get paid for his loss of earnings in attending the hearings and the meeting. NB confirmed that he would not.
6. All present agreed the agenda was acceptable.
7. DR expressed an issue with the location of pole 155, the impact on the large oak trees on her land and with the trees which were to be cut back along the boundary with BD. DR suggested that pole 153 should be moved further down the hill and therefore away from Mr and Mrs Davies' house.
8. BD proposed an option to underground the 11kV line which runs across his land. The four-way pole would need moving along one pole to the west and the 11kV line from the pole near his

house to the new four-way pole would be undergrounded. The project team agreed to take this away to investigate the feasibility.

9. GG clarified with DR that contrary to her statement at one of the hearings, GG was not present at the second meeting WPD had with Mrs Reader on 17 December 2014. DR and IJ agreed to correct this error.
10. The project team provided BD with a 3D visualisation from BD's property to take away. On site DK showed BD where the background hills were shown on the visualisation and BD agreed that it provided a realistic representation of the view.
11. Following the site walk-over, DR and BD prioritised their issues and summarised the ideal solution from their perspective:
12. BD:
  - 12.1. Move pole 153 up to the corner of the field by the silage bales. This would reduce the visual impact the pole would have from his house. The project team highlighted the concern regarding the angle of turn that might be created at pole 153.
  - 12.2. Change access to pole 154 to avoid their well. NB confirmed that this could be agreed by private agreement through the heads of terms and would sit outside of the DCO.
  - 12.3. Undergrounding of two spans of 11kV line and moving the four-way interchange to pole 5A.
  - 12.4. Move pole 154 to the corner of the bottom fields. The reason for doing this is safety of animals as it is easier to fence off a corner of the field than to fence around a pole part-way up the edge of the field. DR explained that she is in favour of this new position if it avoids the two oak trees.
  - 12.5. BD reiterated that minimising visual impact is most important to him.

13. DR:

- 13.1. Move pole 155 back to the other side of the track for visual protection. DR clarified that she does not mind if it is not in the corner of the field, as long as it is fenced off to protect her horses. If it has to be an H-pole to achieve this then that is acceptable. The project team explained that if pole 155 was moved and pole 154 stayed in its current location then an additional pole may be required between 154 and 155 if the span length is too great between poles. IJ suggested that this would be acceptable if it meant being able to move pole 155.
- 13.2. Keeping the two oak trees and the line of trees on the boundary with BD.

**Actions**

1. DK to hand draw the alignment proposed by DR and BD as discussed on site and circulate to IJ, DR and BD along with draft notes of meeting.
2. IJ, DR and BD to review drawing and notes and feedback any comments to NB.
3. Once agreed, WPD will pass proposed alignment to LSTC and RSK to assess from an engineering and environmental perspective.
4. WPD will report back to IJ, DR and BD on:
  - i. Proposed realignment and new pole positions
  - ii. Undergrounding of 11kV line
  - iii. Proposed alternative access to pole 154