From: Andrew Snowden MP [redacted]@parliament.uk >
Sent: 23 February 2026 14:27
To: Secretary of State (Ed Miliband) <Secretary.State@energysecurity.gov.uk >
Subject: Michael Plank, [redacted] (Case Ref: [redacted]

Dear all

I refer to the email below that I have received from one of my constituents.

I would be very grateful if you could look into this case and provide an update on this matter.

Thank you in anticipation of your response and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards

Andrew

Andrew Snowden MP
Member of Parliament for Fylde
House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA

From: Michael Plank
Sent: 18 February 2026 14:10
To: andrew.snowden.mp@parliament.uk
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Morgan & Morecambe Transmission Assets - Planning Inspectorate Review ~ When Does Closed Mean Closed?

Dear Andrew,

David Barlow and myself have been working this case in the background for several months.

On 26th January 2026 Josh Roberts, ReformUK LCC, posted a 35 second video on Facebook explaining how LCC, Wyre & Fylde councils were to prepare a joint green book structured report, a Case for Change, of alternative cabling routes for the Morgan & Morecambe Transmissions Assets. Since then we have heavily researched the Green

Book Process, a HM Treasury process, the Planning Inspectorate process, the Planning Inspectorate being an Executive Agency of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, developed our understanding how these processes, from two different Government Agency processes, work singularly and aligned together when prosecuting a Treasury approved Case for Change, as outlined in the Addendum below.

The EXA inspection process closed on the 29th October, 2025 when all stakeholder contributions had to be submitted. From what we see this may not the case. We know the applicants have continued to contact land owners to secure their land and the Planning Inspectorate has posted, on their website, two letters from the applicants in the last month. These are entitled updates but the first letter raised the 3 scenario concept i.e. two wind assets and a transmission system or two alternative singular power generation and transmission assets in case one power generation assets not delivered. The future of the Morgan OWL is still unclear after one of its major backers, EnBW, withdrew from the project due to not securing AR 6 auction funding. The applicants assume Morgan OWL will still go ahead even though the is no evidence to support this. I have checked out the draft DCOs for all three projects and found no evidence of a 3 scenario concept has been presented!

The second letter was a general update on progress of various items but its our understanding once the inspection examination phase is closed no further information from any stake holder is admissible. Although the Planning Inspectorate have posted these letters they make no comment on them so why are they even there?

WRT Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) prepared by the applicants for Fylde Borough Council (FBC) we believe FBC had concerns the green book process had not having been fully engaged. Also the assessment of the document with 44 significant reds, 96 less significant greens and 2 ambers was far from mature.

Further to this, one of our associates wrote to David Cliff, the chair of Planning Inspectorate examination, to raise concerns the applicants were still trying to secure his land even after the examination process had closed. He received no reply nor even an acknowledgment!

This does not demonstrate to us the Planning Process is being prosecuted with the integrity we expect raising these concerns:

Why are SoS accepting these letters?

Why are SoS posting them into the public domain?

Are the SoS taking any notice of them?

Why are the SoS making no comments on these letters?

Why are the SoS not admonishing the applicants for breach of process?

Our concerns are outlined above and we would encourage you to seek further support to prosecute these concerns to a positive and meaningful outcome.

Kind regards,

Mike (& Dave).

[redacted]

PS Andrew an email response from you would suffice our request.

Addendum

The Greenbook Process prosecute the planning inspectorate prosecute the Planning Inspectorate Process.

The "Green Book " process (HM Treasury guidance on appraisal) and the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) process operate as two distinct but increasingly aligned frameworks in the UK, focusing on economic value versus spatial planning, respectively
. While PINS examines whether a development complies with local/national planning policy (NPPF), the Green Book appraises whether a project provides the best value for money for public expenditure.
The Green Book process "prosecutes " or influences the planning process by setting the economic justification and strategic case that often underpins major infrastructure and development projects (Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - NSIPs).
Key Interactions and Influence
Strategic Case Justification: Before a project reaches a PINS examination, the Green Book requires it to have a strong "Strategic Case " (part of the Five Case Model), defining why action is needed. This strengthens the developers evidence base before they submit to PINS.
Place-Based Analysis: The updated 2026 Green Book places more emphasis on "place-based business cases " and regional equality. This requires developers to justify

projects not just on cost-benefit ratios (BCRs), but on their transformative impact on a specific area, which PINS inspectors may consider.

Moving Beyond BCRs: The 2025/2026 reforms explicitly reject relying solely on BCRs (Benefit-Cost Ratios), acknowledging that high-value projects might have lower initial BCRs but high long-term social or environmental value. This allows for a more holistic, sustainable justification for development that aligns with sustainability policies often tested by PINS.

Environmental Integration: The updated Green Book (2026) integrates environmental principles (e.g., biodiversity, net zero) directly into the appraisal, meaning the "value for money " assessment now explicitly includes environmental costs and benefits, aligning with planning policy on sustainable development.

Evidence for Examinations: While PINS focuses on policy compliance (e.g., Green Belt, local plan), the Green Book provides the detailed economic, social, and environmental evidence that developers use to argue that the benefits of a project outweigh the harms.

Differences in Focus

PINS: Focuses on legality, policy compliance, and land-use impacts (e.g., whether a project is "right " for a specific location).

Green Book: Focuses on financial viability, public value, and economic justification (e.g., whether a project is "worth " the public investment).

In summary, the Green Book provides the economic and strategic rationale , while PINS provides the planning permission and legitimacy , with both processes increasingly working together to ensure development is both financially sound and contextually appropriate.