

**From:** Diana Reader [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 March 2016 21:21  
**To:** Brechfa Connection  
**Subject:** Up-date to the Planning Inspector

Good Afternoon Katherine

We would like to provide an up-date to the Inspector on our current situation and for correctness, to provide information regarding omissions from the recently published WPD document - Communication Between the Applicant & Affected Persons who have not yet agreed HoTs, 3 of 4.

Attached is a copy of a letter sent to Bruton Knowles / WPD jointly by ourselves and our neighbours, Mr and Mrs Davies, in response to an e-mail forwarded by our Agent which had been received by our Agent late in the day, after the close of Deadline 6 on 17th March.

We are becoming increasingly concerned that after nearly three weeks since our meeting with WPD when we provided our suggestions for an alternative route for the line across our properties, we had not heard anything. We are further concerned as today we have received a response to our letter which states that "we will share our report with you in due course". At the meeting and re-enforced in our follow-up letter we requested to be a part of the exercise in considering our suggestions, we offered to engage with the line engineers who would be considering the design constraints and wanted to be able work with WPD to consider the possibilities and the compromises.

With now only two weeks, and with the Easter period in the middle, until the close of the examination we are not sure exactly when "in due course" will be?

We cannot consider agreeing to Heads of Terms until we know what we are agreeing to.

**Communication Between Applicant & Affected Persons who have not yet agreed HoTs, 3 of 4**

We would like to advise the Inspector that three relevant documents which we submitted to the Applicant as of 17th March, have not been included in the file under our section (Mr & Mrs Reader).

Two of the documents have already been submitted to PINs -

21.02.2016 - Letter to WPD confirming issues and requesting engagement - submitted at Deadline 5

27.02.2016 - Letter to WPD confirming our availability for meeting dates

09.03.2016 - Letter to BK / WPD following meeting - submitted at Deadline 6

Yours sincerely  
Diana & Kevin Reader

Letter to BK 22nd March 2016

Sent from my iPad

By e-mail -  
on behalf of -  
Mrs Avril & Mr Bryan Davies  
Mrs Diana & Mr Kevin Reader

Mr N Buxton, Associate

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

21st March 2016

Dear Mr Buxton

Further to your e-mail of the evening of 17th March 2016 to our Agent, when you advised that you had inadvertently distributed for consideration an incorrect version of HoTs, attributed to a version control issue, and additionally commented regarding the site visit to us, Mr & Mrs Davies and Mr & Mrs Reader, on 4th March 2016 where we proposed our suggestions for a route re-alignment.

We would like to challenge your assumption that "it is unlikely that the Examining Authority would consent to modifications to the Order Limits at this late stage in the examining process". We don't think that it is your place to make such assumptions. Additionally, we are only addressing our concerns now "at this late stage in the examining process" due to the refusal for over five months of WPD to engage with us.

You mention in your e-mail that you are aware of Landowners general disquite about the scheme and this is not surprising due to the way Landowners have been treated, the evidence is there for all to see in the submissions made at the various hearings and on the PINs site. When I wrote to Ms Amber Rudd, Secretary of State DECC, last year she advised that we should engage fully in the PINs process. The PINs processes is based on consultation, fairness, transparency and the co-operation of all parties, WPD have not demonstrated these basic principals to us. Had this process been carried out by WPD in the sprit of PINs our co-operation would have been gained and we and WPD would now not be in this current position. Our requests were made known during consultation, they are not unreasonable and could have been factored into the design before it was submitted for inspection.

We would like to re-enforce what we said at the meeting on 4th March. We considered this meeting as the opening of communication with WPD and we requested the opportunity to be a part of a consultation process for evaluating our suggestions for an alternative route across our joint land. It will soon be three weeks since we met and there are only two weeks until the close of this examination and we have heard nothing, this leaves very little time for any consultation with us on our suggestions.

We look forward to hearing from WPD at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely  
Avril & Bryan Davies  
Diana & Kevin Reader

cc Mr A Hubbard, WPD  
Mr I Jones, BJP