



Electricity Act 1989 (Sections 36, 37, 62(3) & Schedule 8)

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 90)

and the

The Electricity Generating Stations and Overhead Lines (Inquiries Procedure((England and Wales) Rules 2007

Application by Vattenfall, dated 30 November 2007 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 59.5MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llanbadarn Fynydd')

Application by Fferm Wynt Llaithddu Cyf, dated 7 May 2008 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 66.7 MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llaithddu')

Application by CeltPower Limited, dated 9 May 2008 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 126MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llandinam')

Application by RES UK & Ireland Limited, dated 27 March 2009 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 100MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Llanbrynmair')

Application by RWE NPower Renewables Limited, dated 11 December 2008 for consent under Section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 to construct and operate a 130-250MW wind turbine generating station in Powys, Mid Wales ('Carnedd Wen')

Application by SP Manweb PLC, dated 2 December 2009 for consent under Section 37 of the Electricity Act 1989 to install and keep installed a 132kV overhead electric line connection from the proposed Llandinam Wind Farm to Welshpool Substation

Cyf ffeil/File ref:

Re: Pinsent Mason's / SP Manweb's request for an extension to the deadline for submission of the SEI.

The purpose of the deadline is largely to enable other interested parties to be able to consider the SEI within a timescale that would reasonably enable them to prepare their final statements of case / proofs of evidence without undue pressure on resources or delay to the timetable. So far as I can gather from the information supplied I note that the other applicants have no objection to the deadline for the SEI being extended to the 12 November. Other 'main' parties appear to be content, subject to there being no new information which might have to be taken into account in drafting statements of case or which would disrupt progress on statements of common ground.

As there may be some flexibility in the session 3 timetable and the run up to it, and discussions appear to be progressing on common ground, it seems to me that it is unlikely that postponing the deadline to the 12 November would cause an overall delay to the timetable. However, many months have passed since the timetable was agreed, and no exceptional or compelling reasons have been given that would justify an overrun. Whilst the objective of making the document as user friendly as possible is laudable this should have been taken into account in the programme for preparing the document.

In the circumstances I am reluctant to formally extend the deadline. However, no automatic 'penalty' would ensue if the deadline were to be missed. Providing SP Manweb to provide sufficient information to the other parties to enable them to prepare their statements of case without undue delay or pressure on their resources it is unlikely that unnecessary or wasted expense would be incurred.

Unless I hear convincing arguments to the contrary, I therefore consider that that the timetable for session 3 should stand for the time being, albeit that it is now likely that the deadline for the submission of the SEI deadline will not be met. I would urge SP Manweb to reduce any overrun to the absolute minimum. They should continue to liaise with the other parties, particularly PCC, NRW and the Alliance, and to provide them with the information they will need as soon as possible.

Andrew Poulter

Inspector

22nd October, 2013