



BY EMAIL

The Examining Authority c/o Nicholas Coombes
The Planning Inspectorate
3/18 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Your Ref EN020014
Our Ref: AREAACC01
65769564.4\te06\648978.07002

Email: steven.edwards@scottishpower.com
Tel: 0141 614 5656

28 October 2015

Dear Sirs

PLANNING ACT 2008

APPLICATION BY SP MANWEB FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE NORTH WALES WIND FARMS CONNECTION

SP Manweb Plc ("SP Manweb") has made an application for development consent ("Application") for a 132 kV Overhead Line together with required pedestrian and vehicular access, temporary construction compound, construction lay areas, mitigation planting and other integral works ("Proposed Development").

As you are aware, SP Manweb made an application on 16 September 2015, which is known as the Option B submission. This submission includes the following:

1. An application to make non-material amendments to the Application to accommodate a series of amendments to the Proposed Development suggested by landowners;
2. The proposed amendments to the Application require 'additional land' under the terms of the Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010 ("CA Regs"). Therefore the Option B submission also includes a proposed provision in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Purchase) Regulations 2010.

The Examining Authority ("Ex A") considered this application and made a procedural decision to accept the Option B submission on 6 October 2015 ("Procedural Decision").

SP Manweb's solicitors, Pinsent Masons LLP, sent a letter to the Ex A on the 9 October 2015 seeking to clarify the position in relation to a number of statements in that Procedural Decision. In particular, at paragraph 7 of that letter it was stated that:

Option A and Option B are presented as alternatives to the Examining Authority and the Secretary of State and the DCO to be made by the Secretary of State will be for either Option A or Option B and it will not be possible for the Examining Authority to choose discreet sections of Option B.

SP Manweb has reviewed its position in respect of this statement, to see whether it can provide further flexibility to the Ex A during the examination and for the Secretary of State when she

makes her decision. SP Manweb considers that the following approaches are available to the Ex A (and the Secretary of State) should it decide to recommend (and the Secretary of State grant) development consent, all of which are acceptable to SP Manweb:

1. Grant development consent for Option A; and
2. Grant development consent for Option B (which is Option A subject to 16 changes at discreet sections along the line).

In the event that, following any representations on Option B and the Hearings due to be held in December 2015, the Ex A considers that only some of the 16 changes in Option B should be authorised, the Ex A could recommend those changes it considers acceptable in Option B with the remainder of the line being formed of Option A. In other words, recommend to the Secretary of State that she grants development consent for part of Option A and part of Option B. This approach is as described in the Procedural Decision at paragraph 4.2.

All of the approaches described above are technically possible and SP Manweb would be content with development consent for any of the approaches referred to.

At this stage, SP Manweb has submitted a draft DCO for Option A (i.e. paragraph 1) and it included a schedule of proposed amendments to this DCO for Option B (i.e. paragraph 2), in its Option B submission (see Annex 2 of OPTION B CA DOCUMENT 1). An Option B DCO was not submitted given the limited number of changes (primarily limited to definitions of the plans) and so as not to confuse the public.

If, following the Hearings and representations on Option B, the Ex A considers that, should it make a recommendation for development consent, it prefers part of Option B with the remainder of the line forming part of Option A, then it would assist SP Manweb if the Ex A were able to provide guidance as to those parts of Option B that it considers should be taken forward as early as possible so as to provide an opportunity for SP Manweb to submit a revised DCO (and associated documentation) to assist the Ex A in its deliberations.

When SP Manweb submits its final preferred DCO, SP Manweb will submit full versions of the DCO that cover paragraphs 1 to 2 above.

I trust the above clarifies the approaches available to the Ex A and Secretary of State. I should also be grateful if this letter could be published on the Planning Inspectorate's website so as to inform interested parties, particularly in the context of the relevant representation period which closes on 13 November 2015 at noon.

If you have any queries in relation to this submission, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Steven Edwards
Land & Planning, SP Energy Networks for SP Manweb