

# SP MANWEB



## **Reinforcement to the North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network**

Deadline 7 Submission

Application Reference: EN020021

**Responses to Written Representations Submitted at  
Deadline 6**

# **Reinforcement to the North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network**

## **Responses to Written Representations Submitted at Deadline 6**

**July 2019**  
**PINS Reference EN020021**

**QA Box**

<b>Author</b>		<b>SP Manweb</b>	
<b>Planning Inspectorate Application Reference</b>		<b>EN020021</b>	
<b>Date</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Description/Changes</b>
31/07/2019	1	Final	Submitted to PINS (Deadline 7)

SP Manweb plc, Registered Office: 3 Prenton Way Prenton CH43 3ET. Registered in England No. 02366937

**CONTENTS**

1. Introduction.....4

2. Canal and River Trust .....4

3. Highways England.....6

4. R.G. and G.M. Stokes.....7

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This document provides SP Manweb's comments on the submissions made to the Examining Authority at Deadline 6 (19<sup>th</sup> July) by the Canal & River Trust (REP6-008), Highways England (REP6-009), and R.G and G.M. Stokes (REP6-010).
- 1.2. This document therefore provides:
- SP Manweb's response to the Canal and River Trust's comments regarding negotiations on a land agreement (Section 2 below);
  - SP Manweb's response to comments by Highways England (set out in Section 3.0 below); and
  - SP Manweb's response to comments submitted by R.G. and G.M. Stokes at Deadline 6 (Section 4.0 below).

## 2. CANAL & RIVER TRUST

<b>Subject Matter: Land Agreement (REP6-008)</b>
<p>In terms of the land agreement, the Trust have made an effort to undertake meaningful negotiations with the applicant and we contacted Shropshire Council on 22 November 2018 (please see attached) to highlight our concerns regarding the lack of engagement and the quality of the pre-application consultation. Notwithstanding this, the applicant has only sought to progress negotiations since mid-June 2019. At deadline five, we advised the ExA that a meeting was to be arranged shortly to progress negotiations. Unfortunately, a meeting has not yet been arranged. The Trust have had no further correspondence from the applicant since our last email to them on 8th July in relation to this matter.</p> <p>As stated throughout this process, the Trust object to the use of compulsory acquisition powers in relation to the Trust's interests. We do not consider that the applicant has complied with the Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (September 2013) ("the Guidance") because the applicant has not demonstrated that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition have been explored {paragraph 8}. One reasonable alternative would be to agree by private treaty the necessary</p>

**Subject Matter: Land Agreement (REP6-008)**

rights but the applicant has failed to progress discussions in respect of this. In addition, it is noted that paragraph 25 of the Guidance makes clear that applicants should only seek to acquire land compulsorily where attempts to acquire by agreement fail. In these circumstances, no meaningful attempts to acquire by agreement have been made.

**SP Manweb Response**

- 2.1. SP Manweb first approached the Trust in August 2018 to commence the process of enabling agreement, by means of a voluntary land agreement between the parties. This initial approach was with regard to the 'Code of Practice' application process for engineering approvals. Following email confirmation and enclosures from the Trust dated 28 August 2018 that they would progress the Code of Practice application accordingly, SP Manweb engaged with the Trust to progress a voluntary consent.
- 2.2. On 22 January 2019, the Trust's Works Engineer confirmed that they require certain information, "height of the cables over the canal, etc. These details need to be incorporated into the Scottish Power Omnibus Agreement". The Omnibus Agreement between the parties has been the longstanding standard agreement by which electricity apparatus has been placed on the Trust's land. It was however, considered by SP Manweb that it may be more appropriate for the proposed Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project to be secured under permanent rights and as such a Deed of Easement was proposed, by means of an Option Agreement.
- 2.3. The Trust, while willing to consider an Option Agreement, presented terms for the grant of permanent rights that were not acceptable to SP Manweb. In order to move matters forward SP Manweb offered to accept the Trust's original position of a voluntary agreement under the standard Omnibus Agreement and communicated the same on 20 June 2019.
- 2.4. The Trust have stated that the proposed crossing of the Canal would not fall within the remit of the Omnibus Agreement with Scottish Power as the agreement includes reference to the Code of Practice, which at Part 2: para 2.1, stipulates that overhead crossings are not permissible on environmental grounds.. This was in contradiction to the Trust's previous position.

- 2.5. SP Manweb does not accept that the Code of Practice applies in this regard as the DCO application is for an overhead line. SP Manweb therefore considers the Omnibus Agreement could be used.
- 2.6. Following the letter submitted by the Trust to Examining Authority on 16th July (REP6-008), a further email was sent by SP Manweb, on 19 July 2019, requesting that the Trust reconsider their position with regards to agreeing matters under the Omnibus Agreement between the parties and for them to proceed on that basis.
- 2.7. SP Manweb has followed up the latest correspondence with telephone enquiries and has not yet had a response from the Trust. In the event of a signed Omnibus Agreement SP Manweb would then withdraw its position on seeking rights by compulsory acquisition.

### 3. HIGHWAYS ENGLAND

<b>Subject Matter: Final Draft DCO (REP6 – 009)</b>
<p>We write following the recent correspondence from the applicant to the Examining Authority (ExA) in advance of Deadline 6 that was published on 5 July 2019 .....(AS-014)</p> <p>That correspondence sets out an agreed position between the applicant and ourselves over the wording of the final draft DCO.</p> <p>On the proviso that the agreed wording is subsequently translated into the final DCO issued for the Secretary of State's consideration we are pleased to record that all our concerns raised in earlier correspondence have been fully dealt with by the applicant.</p>

#### SP Manweb Response

- 3.1. SP Manweb notes the correspondence from the Highways England and confirms that the wording has been included in the Draft DCO submitted at deadline 6 (REP6-004) and will be included in the Final Draft DCO which will be submitted at Deadline 8.
- 3.2. On this basis SP Manweb welcomes the comments from Highways England and acknowledge the agreement reached between the parties.

## 4. R.G. AND G.M. STOKES

### Subject Matter: Routeing of the OHL (REP6 – 010)

... our objections to the newly proposed route were raised only by the introduction of the 'Northern Route'. The initial route, now known as the 'Southern Route', was planned to go across our land, of which we have no objection.

We feel, and have documented our frustration to SP Energy on multiple occasions,....In addition, we held 1 to 1 meetings at our home with SP Energy staff, where we feel that there was no acknowledgement or sense of understanding of our issues. Our letters received no written response and during any arranged meeting, we were bombarded with facts of how SP Energy were going to proceed without the will to compromise.

We acknowledge that small changes have been made to access routes, however the only justification for the proposed 'Northern Route', is that SP Energy had listened to the thoughts and feelings of the 'villagers of Noneley' none of which are landowners, or will be directly affected by either route.

### SP Manweb Response

- 4.1. SP Manweb confirms that all the letters included in the Deadline 6 Submission (REP6-010) were submitted by the Stokes family during the statutory consultation (23rd November 2017 to 2nd February 2018), with the exception of the final letter (dated Friday 11th May 2018), which was submitted during the further consultation (12th April 2018 to 25th May 2018).
- 4.2. As stated in paras 9.2.14 to 9.2.16 in the Consultation Report (**DCO Document 5.1**, (APP-017), November 2018), SP Manweb reviewed each response received at the statutory consultation stage in the context of the consultation questions provided in the feedback forms. This involved breaking down each response into key themes and summarising each response for SP Manweb to then explain how it had considered each point raised.
- 4.3. Individual responses were not sent to any parties who made submissions at the statutory consultation stage and further consultation stage. A summary of all the relevant responses received at the statutory consultation, along with how SP Manweb has had regard to them and whether or not they led to a change in the proposed development, can be found in Chapters 9 and 10 of the Consultation Report in Tables 9.5 to 9.17. Feedback received following

the further consultation in May 2018 is provided in Tables 10.1 to 10.3 in the Consultation Report.

- 4.4. The Consultation Report sets out how SP Manweb used a Consultation ID Reference system to allow responses from the local community or those with an interest in land to be tracked throughout the consultation. The system allowed SP Manweb to publish anonymised responses and was used for responses from the local community and those with an interest in land (see paras 9.2.7 and 9.2.8 of the Consultation Report).
- 4.5. The key issues raised by the Stokes family (ID74, ID76 and ID82) in their feedback during the two consultation stages and referred to in their representation submitted at Deadline 6 are shown in the table below. This shows SP Manweb's summary of the feedback comment and the accompanying SP Manweb response by reference to the relevant table and page no. in the Consultation Report.
- 4.6. From the table below SP Manweb considers that it has given full consideration to each of the matters raised by the Stokes family.
- 4.7. Furthermore, SP Manweb have agreed to changes across the Stokes' land. This included a change to remove the access routes at the request of the Stokes family where construction access through the farm, including the area benefitting from a planning consent for barn conversions, was removed. In addition, a change was made to the overhead line route to avoid a large mature oak tree and move the line further from the farmhouse. This change is referred to as the 'River Roden' in Chapter 10 of the Consultation Report:

*"River Roden (see Sheet 13 in the Revised Draft Works Plan April 2018 - poles 160 to 166): Changes have been made in response to feedback to move poles 161, 162 and 163 to avoid felling a large mature oak tree and to position pole 164 away from the edge of the river bank". (Para 10.1.4 pg 178)*

(Note: Poles 161 – 163 are on land owned by the Stokes family).

- 4.8. SP Manweb considers the proposed route is acceptable to a number of other landowners as well as local people, as is reflected in letters of support for, and the lack of feedback against, the proposed development, as can be seen on page 162 of the Consultation Report.

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
<b>Points Raised by Stokes Family</b>	<b>SP Manweb's Responses</b>
<p><i>Letters dated 29<sup>th</sup> December, 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018 and 12<sup>th</sup> January 2018</i></p>	<p><i>SP Manweb's responses are provided in</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Table 9.8: Comments relating to Question 1 Section Four of the preferred line and</i></li> <li>• <i>Table 9.16: Comments and SP Manweb Responses in Relation to Question 4</i></li> </ul> <p><i>and are set out below:</i></p>
<p>Continuing from pole 158 north of the River Roden. They stated that this change would mean the line was equidistant between nearby properties. (pg 133)</p>	<p>In reviewing the proposed line route in response to feedback from the EA, SP Manweb has however identified scope for a slight amendment which places the new overhead line behind a mature tree which provides a degree of screening when viewed from Commonwood Farm.</p> <p>This proposed change is referred to as part of the change indicated in relation to the River Roden (see response to the Environment Agency above).</p>
<p>Questioned why the southern route published in May 2017 had been discounted and felt the preferred line route had been introduced without any consultation. They stated that the preferred line route would travel close to several nearby properties. (pg 134)</p>	<p>SP Manweb has noted that the line route presented at the statutory consultation is different to that presented in the May 2017 newsletter, however, it is aware of the continued concerns of the owners/occupiers of land and properties to the north and considers that the alternative line route suggested in the recent feedback would lead again to concerns expressed by them.</p>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
	<p>In response to this feedback, SP Manweb identified a line route running more equidistant between Page 135 of 196 Lower Pools Barn and Commonwood Farm.</p> <p>This change was made in response to the continued concerns of the owners/occupiers of land and properties to the north. A summary of the feedback is outlined in Chapter 2 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 (November 2017) (<b>DCO Document 7.10</b>).</p> <p>Given that the proposed line route does not give rise to significant effects at Commonwood Farm, including the barn conversions referred to in the feedback, SP Manweb does not see a need to alter the line route again.</p>
<p>Stated that the Proposed Development would have an adverse impact on plans to convert barns to residential units on their land. The preferred line route would be around 200m away. They felt that consideration had been given to other barn conversions and the same should happen in this case (pg 135)</p>	<p>SP Manweb received confirmation of a planning application during the additional consultation and details of how this has been considered can be found in Chapter 10.</p>
<p>Concerned about the preferred route now crossing a flood plain on their land and noted that the River Roden embankment on their land had not been reinforced, leading to considerable flooding in the winter. (pg 136)</p>	<p>SP Manweb has received feedback from the Environment Agency in response to the statutory consultation. The ES considers potential effects on hydrology (Chapter 9 'Flood Risk, Water Quality and Resources (<b>DCO Document 6.9</b>)). A Flood Risk Assessment has also been undertaken and submitted with the</p>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
	application for an order granting Development Consent ( <b>DCO Document 5.2</b> ).
Noted that the preferred line route would pass over hedgerows and trees. They noted previous experience of being asked to cut back hedgerows and trees in close proximity to power lines and asked whether this would happen in this case. (pg 136)	Effects on trees and hedgerows are set out in the ES ( <b>DCO Document 6.7</b> ).
Concerned about 'bird strike' from the Proposed Development, particularly in regard to Canadian geese and swans. (pg 136)	In relation to past bird strikes, SP Manweb's records show no incidents being recorded within the last five years. Effects on birds are assessed within Chapter 7 of the ES 'Ecology and Biodiversity' ( <b>DCO Document 6.7</b> ) and Appendices 7.2 and 7.5 ( <b>DCO Documents 6.7.2 and 6.7.5</b> ).
Noted the proximity of Sleaf Airfield and noted plans for it to be used for gravel extraction. They felt this would mean that the operation of the airfield as a supporting factor for discounting the previous southern route was not a consideration. (pg 137)	As stated above, Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 ( <b>DCO Document 7.11</b> ) sets out how SP Manweb considered the southern and northern options around Noneley. This included (para 3.4.81) consideration of the proximity of the operational Sleaf Airfield. This was not a determining factor in the preference for the northern option.
Objected to the proposed route across their field. They wanted to understand why the route as published in November 2017 had not been put forward earlier and why the southern route around Noneley, published in May 2017, was no longer preferred.	See above (Response to ID 74 Pg137), which states ' <i>Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 (DCO Document 7.11) sets out how SP Manweb considered the southern and northern options around Noneley.</i>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
<p>Objected to the proposed route across their field, explaining that it was clay soil which gets very wet and would be damaged by heavy machinery. (pg 137)</p>	<p><i>This included (para 3.4.81) consideration of the proximity of the operational Sleep Airfield. This was not a determining factor in the preference for the northern option.'</i></p> <p>SP Manweb is grateful for the information submitted by the respondent on this matter. Effects on agricultural land are considered within Chapter 11 of the ES (<b>DCO Document 6.11</b>).</p> <p>Standard good practice construction techniques that will be adopted are set out in the draft CEMP (<b>DCO Document 6.3.2</b>).</p>
<p>Stated they did not take part at earlier stages as they were not directly affected by the published options. Noted the first time an option came near their property was Project Update Three (May 2017) and it was not the preferred option.</p> <p>Concerned that landowners had not been consulted before the preferred line route was published in November 2017. (pg 161)</p>	<p>The respondent has always been within the consultation zones for the project, and has been sent the widely circulated project updates. As with all residents within the consultation zone, the respondent has had the opportunity to view the proposed changes at the statutory consultation stage and engage with SP Manweb.</p>
<b>Points Raised by Stokes Family</b>	<b>SP Manweb's Responses</b>
<p><i>Letter received 29/01/18</i></p>	<p><i>SP Manweb's response are provided in:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Table 9.8: Comments and SP Manweb Responses in relation to Question 1 in Section Four of the preferred line</i></li> <li>• <i>Table 9.12: Comments and SP Manweb Responses in Relation to Question 2 in Section Four preferred line</i></li> </ul>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Table 9.16: Comments and SP Manweb Responses in Relation to Question 4</i></li> <li>• <i>Table 9.17: Comments and SP Manweb Responses in Relation to Question 5</i></li> </ul> <p><i>and are set out below:</i></p>
<p>Opposed to the preferred line route and expressed support for the previously discounted route south of Noneley. Felt that the preferred line route impacted more occupied properties and that, as it was on higher ground, any screening from existing mature trees would be minimal. (pg 139)</p>	<p>Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 (<b>DCO Document 7.11</b>) sets out SP Manweb's consideration of the Noneley North option which included having regard to likely landscape and visual, ecological and heritage impacts, and its conclusions that this option would have slightly less adverse environmental effects and so is preferred over the southern option. In SP Manweb's view the visual impacts of the northern route option would be localised compared to the more open views of the southerly route.</p>
<p>Concerned about the effects the preferred line route would have on views of what they consider to be currently unspoiled countryside and views were an issue on all the options and should not be a factor in selecting one option over another. (pg 140)</p>	<p>Visual impacts on views from a number of receptors such as local roads, points of interest and public footpaths in both options have been assessed. These receptors also include the impact on the residential visual amenity enjoyed by occupiers of nearby properties. Paragraphs 3.4.23 to 3.4.34 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 (<b>DCO Document 7.11</b>) explain SP Manweb's approach to assessing the likely visual impacts of the Noneley North and South options. The report notes that the level of impact on the existing views would</p>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
	be slightly greater for the southerly option.
Concerns about impacts on business operations due to the Proposed Development. This included continuing operations at a working farm as well as the potential for barn conversions on the site. (pg 141)	Effects on agricultural land are considered within Chapter 11 of the ES ( <b>DCO Document 6.11</b> ). Standard good practice construction techniques will be Page 142 of 196 adopted as set out in the draft CEMP ( <b>DCO Document 6.3.2</b> ).
Noted wet conditions in some fields and asked how long the proposed wood poles last in these conditions and what the process for replacing wood poles is. (pg 142)	The assessment of the likely impacts of the northerly option included ecological impacts which in turn included impacts on birds. Given the similar nature of ecological features on both route options, the outcome of this assessment was that there is little difference between the two route options in this regard. Effects on birds are assessed within Chapter 7 'Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES ( <b>DCO Document 6.7</b> ), and Appendices 7.5 'Ornithology Survey ( <b>DCO Document 6.7.5</b> ).
Noted migrating birds use many of the fields that the preferred line route is planned to use. (pg 142)	The assessment of the likely impacts of the northerly option included ecological impacts which in turn included impacts on birds. Given the similar nature of ecological features on both route options, the outcome of this assessment was that there is little difference between the two route options in this regard. Effects on birds are assessed within Chapter 7 'Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES ( <b>DCO Document 6.7</b> ), and Appendices 7.5 'Ornithology Survey ( <b>DCO Document 6.7.5</b> ).

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
<p>Challenged the heritage findings of the Updated Line Route Report 2 specifically Grafton Farmhouse and questioned why fields in the nearby area have been described as 'post-war fields'. (pg 142)</p>	<p>This comment is made in relation to Section 3.4 of the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 (<b>DCO Document 7.11</b>)</p> <p>The Report notes in 3.4.62 that effects at Grafton Farmhouse are assessed as being at the lower end of minor due to its poor visual connection to the surrounding landscape. Effects have been assessed as higher at other listed properties along the southern route. The reference to 'post war fields' in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 (<b>DCO Document 7.11</b>) refers to the change in field patterns that has occurred over time (i.e from small fields to larger amalgamated fields) rather than just the immediate post war period.</p>
<p>Concerns about removing mature oak and ash trees, particularly at poles 158 and 160. (pg 143)</p>	<p>SP Manweb is proposing a change to the line route to avoid trees, including a large mature oak tree close to pole no. 160. SP Manweb seeks to avoid removing trees wherever possible. Effects on trees are considered within the ES (<b>DCO Document 6.7</b>).</p>
<p>Raised an issue with access to pole 160 and noted that this will be unavailable as it runs close to working barns. (pg 154)</p>	<p>SP Manweb will work closely with the landowner to negotiate the use of this access in a way that minimises disruption to the occupiers of the barns.</p>
<p>Asked for disruption to the local road network to be kept as low as possible. (pg 154)</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
Concerned that SP Manweb had placed more emphasis on certain people's views it had received, than on others. (pg 162)	Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 ( <b>DCO Document 7.11</b> ) sets out how SP Manweb considered the southern and northern options around Noneley.
Concerned that SP Manweb documents did not include photographs of their land and provided these (for the Noneley section). (pg 165)	Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 ( <b>DCO Document 7.11</b> ) sets out how SP Manweb considered the southern and northern options around Noneley.  SP Manweb has considered all feedback together with its own environmental assessments, and landowner feedback.
Suggested that objections to the southern option around Noneley had been listened to and the route was a fait accompli. Stated the need for SP Manweb to consider new objections in the same manner as it had done to those received at previous stages (pg 166)	Please refer to the response to Cons ID ref 82 above (Pg 162), which states ' <i>Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2, November 2017 (DCO Document 7.11) sets out how SP Manweb considered the southern and northern options around Noneley.</i>  <i>SP Manweb has considered all feedback together with its own environmental assessments, and landowner feedback</i>
Concerned that homeowners and their views of the landscape have been given more influence than those whose land and farming practices will be affected (for the Noneley section) (pg 167)	Section 3.4 in the Updated Line Route Report 2 November 2017 ( <b>DCO Document 7.10</b> ) sets out how SP Manweb considered the southern and northern options around Noneley. SP Manweb has considered all feedback together with its own environmental assessments, and landowner feedback.

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
<b>Points Raised by Stokes Family</b>	<b>SP Manweb's Responses</b>
<i>Letter received 11<sup>th</sup> May 2018</i>	<p><i>SP Manweb's responses are provided in:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Table 10.2: Comments Relating to a Specific Proposed Change in the Additional Consultation.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>and are set out below:</i></p>
Providing further evidence of flooding on land where proposed poles are sited. (pg 184)	Refer to the SP Manweb response to the same ID Ref in Table 9.8 in Chapter 9 above.
<p>Noted proximity of proposed development to existing property as well as buildings due to be developed.</p> <p>Felt they had not received a response from SP Manweb to their previous feedback.</p> <p>Opposed an access route that they suggested goes through their garden. Also notes that published access routes will be blocked by a proposed barn conversion.</p> <p>Feels they have not been given sufficient time to state their objections, particularly when compared to the time given for the earlier proposals south of Noneley.</p> <p>Claims the northern route presents a risk to wild birds in the area.</p> <p>Claims SP Manweb has not consulted with their family, who are landowners with poles on their land.</p> <p>Feels they have been misled that the route would take the earlier,</p>	<p>Refer to the SP Manweb response to the same ID Ref in Table 9.8 in Chapter 9 above.</p> <p>SP Manweb met with the landowner and advised of the DCO process and opportunity for further representations if the application is accepted.</p> <p>Following further discussions with the landowner, SP Manweb has removed the proposed construction access through Commonwood Farm buildings to avoid the site of the proposed barn conversion.</p> <p>SP Manweb has consulted with landowners and local communities at several stages during the project and has considered all feedback together with its own environmental assessments, and landowner feedback.</p>

<b>SP Manweb's responses to points raised by the Stokes family in the statutory and additional consultation (May 2018)</b>	
southern route around Noneley. (pg 184)	

<b>Subject Matter: Engagement by SP Manweb (REP6 – 010)</b>
As landowners which BOTH routes affect our land, we would have hoped that SP Energy would have thought it beneficial to have corresponded closer with us, rather than against us. We acknowledge that a route is needed, however, the actions which SP Energy have portrayed to force the northern Route should be reviewed.

**SP Manweb Response**

4.9. SP Manweb met Mr Stokes in April 2017 to discuss the Design Freeze 2 (DF2) proposal (Noneley North option) and a voluntary land agreement:

- The Noneley South proposal was to route the proposed overhead line south of the settlement of Noneley, in the vicinity of Sleaf airfield.
- The Noneley North proposal was to route the proposed overhead line north of Noneley, between the settlements of Loppington and Noneley.
- The Noneley North route proposal was progressed on the basis that the landscape provides for greater screening opportunities, the existing 33kV overhead line provides for a combined context with the proposed 132kV overhead line and the outlook for a group of properties in Noneley are towards the south and the slightly more open landscape. The Noneley South route would be located within the vicinity of a SSSI site and it is preferable to avoid such sites.

4.10. Mr Stokes stated that Noneley South route option was his preferred option and that he would not consent to the Noneley North route option.

4.11. Engagement, prior to July 2019, including the meeting referred to above, is summarised in the table below:

12.04.17	Meeting – SPM presented for discussions the draft route design (DF2 dated 01.03.17). Mr Stokes advised that the original route (4.0) was preferred
28.04.17	Meeting with Mr Stokes. Confirmed that he would be willing to grant consent via a wayleave agreement for the original route (4.0) but was not convinced that the alternative route (4.1) was better.
21.06.17	Site meeting to provide update on the project, and particularly minor DF3 changes to the options currently being considered.
12.10.17	DF4 - Request for Information/Land Interest Questionnaire (RFI/LIQ) pack hand delivered by SPM. Mr R Stokes advised that the new revised Northern route was worse than before and he thought that this would make the future development of his farm buildings into residential dwellings (barn conversion) a much more difficult prospect and he felt that he would need to be compensated for this. He also advised that he would object to this route and resist any access through their farm.
22.05.18	Meeting - Mr & Mrs Stokes confirmed that they are still strongly against the current Northern route and added that the access route would run through an area which they have planning consent for barn conversions to residential use. The meeting was followed by a site visit to review the area.
22.06.18	Email from SPM attaching a copy of the file note recording the meeting and requesting a further site visit to check the route and access options.
05.07.18	Exchange of emails to arrange a site visit by members of the SPM project team
24.07.18	Email from SPM requesting a change to the site meeting.
15.08.18	Email exchanges to make arrangements for a site meeting by members of the SP Manweb team.
20.08.18	Email exchanges to finalise the site meeting by members of the SPM team.
29.08.18	Site meeting at Commonwood Farm. The Stokes family were advised of the proposed changes to the access route, which they accepted as an improvement, although they made it clear that they were not agreeable to the Northern route option.

19.09.18	Letter sent by Mr & Mrs Stokes to the Communications Team, objecting to the proposed Northern route for the new 132kV overhead line.
19.11.18	Halls Land Agents engaged by the Stokes'. Email from SPM to Halls requesting meeting with their clients to hand over the recently prepared Heads of Terms (HoTs).
20.11.18	Telephone call from Halls to SPM requesting a copy of the HoT for their clients.
13.12.18	Email from SPM to Halls requesting confirmation that they had been officially appointed by Mr & Mrs Stokes.
13.12.18	Email from SPM to Halls to confirm the DCO process and request that arrangements were made for SPM to meet with his clients.
13.12.18	Email from Halls to confirming they had been instructed to act on behalf of Mr & Mrs Stokes.
13.12.18	Copy of the HoT and all associated overhead line route plan and tree works plans hand delivered to Mr & Mrs Stokes.
14.12.18	Email from SPM to Halls confirming that the HoT and plans had been sent to Mr & Mrs Stokes (copy attached for their records).
28.01.19	Email from SPM to Halls requesting an update on progress and requesting a meeting be arranged with his clients.
28.01.19	Email from Halls advising of availability in February to meet with his clients.
28.01.19	Email from SPM to Halls to confirm availability for a meeting.
29.01.19	Email from Halls to confirm would prefer to meet with all of his clients affected by the scheme (7 clients in total) on the same day, therefore this would have to be after 15th Feb due to leave.
30.01.19	Email from SPM to Halls confirming availability.
21.02.19	Telephone call from SPM to Halls to chase up a date for a meeting (voice message left).
21.02.19	Email from SPM to Halls chasing a date for a meeting

---

21.02.19	Email from Halls requesting the 28th February as a provisional date to meet with their clients.
21.02.19	Reply to Halls from SPM confirming availability for 28th February 2019.
26.02.19	Telephone call from SPM to Halls to confirm arrangements for site meeting.
28.02.19	Meeting between SPM and Halls to meet all their clients. Halls advised that Mr & Mrs Stokes had not agreed to meet with SPM, and they would discuss the HoT direct with their agent.
10.05.19	Telephone call from SPM to Halls to chase update on their client's position. Halls advised that they would chase this up.
21.05.19	Telephone call from SPM to Halls to chase up progress. AMB advised that she was waiting for SJ to liaise with Mr & Mrs Stokes and establish their position.
23.05.19	SPM chased Halls for further updates (voice message left to call back).
24.05.19	Two telephone calls from SPM to Halls (voice message left to call back with an update).
11.06.19	Telephone call from SPM to Halls for update. No further update available.
18.06.19	SPM chased Halls for further updates. No further update available.
02.07.19	Telephone call from SPM to Halls for further update.